THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutatory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXX.—JULY, 1905—No. 119.

ENCYCLICAL OF HIS HOLINESS POPE PIUS X. ON THE TEACHING OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.

SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI PII DIVINA PROVIDENTIA PAPAE X. LITTERAE ENCYCLICAE AD SACROS UNIVERSI CATHOLICI ORBIS ANTISTITES DE CHRISTIANA DOCTRINA TRADENDA VENERABILIBUS FRATRIBUS PATRIARCHIS PRIMATIBUS ARCHIEPISCOPIS EPISCOPIS ALIISQUE LOCORUM ORDINARIIS CUM APOSTOLICA SEDE PACEM ET COMMUNIONEM HABENTIBUS.

PIUS PP. X.

Venerabiles Fratres, Salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.

ACERBO nimis ac difficili tempore ad supremi pastoris munus, in universum Christi gregem gerendum, arcanum Dei consilium tenuitatem Nostram evexit. Inimicus namque homo sic gregem ipsum iam du obambulat vaferrimaque insidiatur astutia, ut nunc vel maxime illud factum esse videatur, quod senioribus Ecclesiae Ephesi praenuntiabat Apostolus: "Ego scio quoniam intrabunt . . . lupi rapaces in vos, non parcentes gregi." (Acts xx., 29.) Cuius quidem religiosae rei inclinationis, quicumque adhuc divinae gloriae studio feruntur, causas rationesque inquirunt; quas dum alii alias afferunt, diversas, pro sua quisque sententia, ad Dei regnum in hisce terris tutandum restituendumque sequuntur vias. Nobis Venerabiles Fratres, quamvis cetera non respuamus,

Entered accordinging to Act of Congress, in the year 1905, by P. J. Ryan, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

iis maxime assentiendum videtur, quorum iudicio et praesens animorum remissio ac veluti imbecillitas, quaeque inde gravissima oriuntur mala, ex divinarum ignoratione rerum praecipue sunt repetenda. Congruit id plane cum eo, quod Deus ipse per Oseam prophetam dixit: ". . . Et non est scientia Dei in terra. Maledictum, et mendacium, et homicidium, et furtum, et adulterium iundaverunt, et sanguis sanguinem tetigit. Propter hoc lugebit terra, et infirmabitur omnis, qui habitat in ea." (Os. iv., 1, ss.)

Et re quidem vera, aetate hac nostra esse quamplurimos in christiano populo, qui in summa ignoratione eorum versentur, quae ad salutem aeternam nosse oportet, communes, eaeque proh dolor! non iniustae, sunt quaerimoniae. Quum vero christianum dicimus populum, non plebem tantum aut sequioris coetus homines significamus, qui saepenumero aliquam ignorantiae excusationem ex eo admittunt, quod immitium dominorum imperio cum pareant, vix sibi suisque temporibus servire queunt: sed illos etiam et maxime, qui etsi ingenio cultuque non carent, profana quidem eruditione affatim pollent, ad religionem tamen quod attinet, temere omnino atque imprudenter vivunt. Difficile dictu est quam crassis hi saepe tenebris obvolvantur; quodque magis dolendum est, in iis tranquille iacent! De summo rerum omnium auctore ac moderatore Deo, de christianae fidei sapientia nulla fere ipsis cogitatio. Hinc vero nec de Verbi Dei incarnatione, nec de perfecta ab ipso humani generis restauratione quidquam norunt; nihil de Gratia, quae potissimum est adiumentum ad aeternorum adeptionem, nihil de Sacrificio augusto aut de Sacramentis, quibus gratiam ipsam assequimur ac retinemus. Peccato autem quid nequitiae insit quid turpitudinis nullo pacto aestimatur; unde nec eius vitandi nec deponendi sollicitudo ulla sicque ad supremum usque diem venitur, ut sacerdos, ne spes absit salutis, extrema agentium animam momenta, quae fovendae maxime caritati in Deum impendi oporteret, edocendo summatim religionem tribuat: si tamen, quod fere usuvenit, usque adeo culpabili ignorantiâ moriens non laboret ut et sacerdotis operam supervacaneam arbitretur et, minime placato Deo, tremendum aeternitatis viam securo animo ingrediendam putet. Unde merito scripsit Benedictus XIV. decessor Noster: "Illud affirmamus, magnam eorum partem, qui aeternis suppliciis damnantur, eam calamitatem perpetuo subire ob ignorantiam mysteriorum fidei, quae scire et credere necessario debent, ut inter electos cooptentur." (Instit. xxvi., 18.)

Haec quum ita sint, Venerabiles Fratres, quid quaeso mirabimur, si tanta sit modo inque dies augescat, non inter barbaras inquimus nationes, sed in ipsis gentibus quae christiano nomine feruntur, corruptela morum et consuetudinum depravatio? Paulus quidem

apostolus ad Ephesios scribens haec edicebat: "Fornicatio autem, et omnis immunditia, aut avaritia, nec nominetur in vobis, sicut decet sanctos; aut turpitudo, aut stultiloquium." (Ephes. v., 3 s.) At vero sanctimoniae huic ac pudori cupiditatum moderatori divinarum rerum sapientiae fundamentum posuit: "Videte itaque, fratres, quomodo caute ambuletis: non quasi insipientes, sed ut sapientes. . . . Propterea nolite fieri imprudentes, sed intelligentes quae sit voluntas Dei." (Ephes. v., 15 ss.)

Et plane id merito. Voluntas namque hominis inditum ab ipso auctore Deo honesti rectique amorem, quo in bonum non adumbratum sed sincerum veluti rapiebatur, vix retinet adhuc. Curruptelâ primaevae labis depravata, ac Dei factoris sui quasi oblita, eo affectum omnem convertit ut diligat vanitatem et quaerat mendacium. Erranti igitur pravisque obcaecatae cupiditatibus voluntati duce opus est qui monstret viam, ut male desertas repeat iustitiae semitas. Dux autem, non aliunde quesitus, sed a natura comparatus, mens ipsa est: quae si germana careat luce, divinarum nempe rerum notitia, illu habebitur, quod coecus coeco ducatum praestabit et ambo in foveam cadent. Sanctus rex David, quum Deum de veritatis indidisset: "Signatum est," aiebat, "super nos lumen vultus tui, Domine." (Ps. iv., 7.) Quid porro ex hac largitione luminis sequatur addidit, inquiens: "Dedisti laetitiam in corde meo;" laetitiam videlicet, qua dilatatum cor nostrum, viam mandatorum divinorum currat.

Quod revera ita esse facile consideranti patet. Deum namque eiusque infinitas quas perfectiones nominamus, longe exploratius, quam naturae vires scrutentur, christiana nobis sapientia manifestat. Quid porro? Iubet haec simul summum ipsum Deum officio "fidei" nos revereri, quae mentis est; "spei" quae voluntatis; "caritatis" quae cordis: sicque totum hominem supremo illi Auctori ac Moderatori mancipat. Similiter una est Iesu Christi doctrina, quae germanam praestabilemque hominis aperit dignitatem, quippe qui sit filius Patris caelestis qui in caelis est, ad imaginem eius factus cumque eo aeternum beateque victurus. At vero ex hac ipsa dignitate eiusdemque notitiâ infert Christus debere homines se amare invicem ut fratres, vitam heic degere, ut lucis filios decet, "non in commessationibus, et ebrietatibus; non in cubilibus et impudicitiis; non in contentione, et aemulatione" (Rom. xiii., 13); iubet pariter omnem sollicitudinem nostram proiicere in Deum, quoniam ipsi cura est de nobis; iubet tribuere egenis, benefacere iis qui nos oderunt, aeternas animi utilitates fluxis huius temporis bonis anteponere. Ne autem omnia singulatim attingamus, nonne ex Christi institutione homini superbius audenti demissio animi, quae verae gloriae origo est, suadetur ac praecipitur? "Quicumque . . .

humiliaverit se . . . hic est maior in regno caelorum." (Matth. xviii., 4.) Ex ea prudentiam spiritus docemur, qua prudentiam carnis caveamus; iustitiam, qua ius tribuamus cuique suum; fortitudinem, qua parati simus omnia perpeti, erectoque animo pro Deo sempiternaque beatitade patiamur; temperantiam denique, qua vel pauperiem pro regno Dei adamemus, quin et in ipsa cruce gloriemur, confusione contempta. Stat igitur, ab christiana sapientia, non modo intellectum nostram mutuari lumen, quo veritatem assequatur sed voluntatem etiam ardorem concipere, quo evehamur in Deum cumque Eo virtutis exercitatione iungamur.

Longe equidem absumus ut ex his asseramus, pravitatem animi corruptionemque morum non posse cum religionis scientia coniungi. Utinam non id plus nimio probarent facta! Contendimus tamen, ubi crassae ignorantiae tenebris sit mens circumfusa, nullatenus posse aut rectam voluntatem esse aut mores bonos. Apertis namque oculis si quis incedat, poterit ille sane de recto tutoque itinere declinare: qui tamen caecitate laborat, huic periculum certe quidem imminet. Adde porri: corruptionem morum, si fidei lumen penitus non sit extinctum, spem, lumen penitus non sit extinctum, spem lumen penitus non sit extinctum, spem facere emendationis; quod si utrumque iungitur et morum pravitas et fidei ob ignorationem defectio, vix erit medicinae locus, patetque ad ruinam via.

Quum igitur ex ignorantia religionis tam multa tamque gravia deriventur damna; alia vero ex parte, quum tanta sit religiosae institutionis necessitas atque utilitas, frustra enim christiani hominis officia impleturus speratur qui illa ignoret: iam ulterius inquirendum venit, cuius demum sit perniciosissimam hanc ignorantiam cavere mentibus, adeoque necessaria scientia animos imbuere. Quae res, Venerabiles Fratres, nullam habet dubitationem gravissimum namque id munus ad omnes pertinet, quotquot sunt animarum pastores. Hi sane, ex Christi praecepto, creditas sibi oves agnoscere tenentur ac pascere; pascere autem hoc primum est, docere; "Dabo vobis," sic nempe Deus per Ieremiam promittebat, "pastores juxta cor meum, et pescent vos scientiâ et doctrina." (Ier. iii., 15.) Unde et Apostolus Paulus aiebat: "Non . . . misit me Christus baptiszare, sed evangelizare" (I. Cor. i., 17), indicans videlicet primas eorum partes, qui regendae aliquo modo Ecclesiae sunt positi, esse in instituendis ad sacra fidelibus.

Cuius quidem institutionis laudes persequi supervacaneum ducimus, quantique ea sit apud Deum ostendere. Certe miseratio quam pauperibus ad levandas angustias tribuimus, magnam a Deo habet laudem. At longe maiorem quis neget habere studium et laborem, quo, non fluxas corporibus utilitates, sed aeternas animis docendo monendoque conciliamus? Nihil profecto optatius, nihil gratius

queat Iesu Christo animarum servatori accidere, qui de se per Isaiam professus est: "Evangelizare pauperibus misit me." (Luc. iv., 18.)

Hic tamen praestat, Venerabiles Fratres, hoc unum consectari atque urgere, nullo sacerdotem quemlibet graviori officio teneri, nullo arctiori nexu obligari. Etenim in sacerdote ad vitae sanctimoniam debere scientiam adiici, quis neget? "Labia . . . sacerdotis custodient scientiam." (Malach. ii., 7.) Atque illam reapse severissime Ecclesia requirit in iis qui sint sacerdotio initiandi. Quorsum id vero? Quia scilicet ab eis divinae legis notitiam christiana plebs expectat, illosque ad eam impertiendam destinat Deus: "Et legem requirent ex ore eius: quia angelus Domini exercituum est." (Malach. ii., 7.) Quamobrem Episcopus, in sacra initiatione, sacerdotii candidatos alloquens: "Sit," inquit, "doctrina vestra spiritualis medicina populo Dei; sint providi cooperatores ordinis nostri; ut in lege sua die ac nocte meditantes, quod legerint credant, quod crediderint doceant." (Pontif. Rom.)

Quod si nemo sacerdos, ad quem haec non pertineant, quid porro de illis censebimus, qui, nomine ac potestate curionum aucti, animarum rectoris munere, vi dignitatis et quodam quasi pacto inito, funguntur? Hi quodammodo pastoribus et doctoribus sunt accensendi, quos dedit Christus ut fideles iam non sint parvuli fluctuantes, et circumferantur omni vento doctrinae in nequitia hominum; veritatem autem facientes in caritate, crescant in illo per omnia, qui est caput Christus. (Ephes. iv., 14-15.)

Quapropter sacrosancta Tridentina Synodus, de animarum pastoribus agens, officium eorum hoc primum et maximum esse edicit, christiam plebem docere. (Sess. v., cap. 2 de ref.; Sess. xxii., cap 8; Sess. xxiv., cap. 4 et 7 de ref.) Hinc iubet illos, dominicis saltem diebus festisque sollemnioribus, de religione ad populum dicere, sacri vero Adventus tempore et Quadragesimae quotidie, vel saltem ter in hebdomada. Neque id modo: addit namque teneri parochos, eisdem saltem dominicis festisque diebus, per se vel per alios, in fidei veritatibus erudire pueros, eosque ad obedientiam in Deum ac parentes instituere. Quum vero sacramenta fuerint administranda, praecipit, ut qui sunt suscepturi, de eorumdem vi, facili vulgarique sermone, doceantur.

Quas sacrosanctae Synodi praescriptiones Benedictus XIX. decessor Noster, in sua Constitutione "Etsi minime," sic brevi complexus est ac distinctius definivit: "Duo potissimum onera a Tridentina Synodo curatoribus animarum sunt imposita: alterum, ut festis diebus de rebus divinis sermones ad populum habeant; alterum, ut pueros et rudiores quosque divinae legis fideique rudimentis informent." Iure autem sapientissimus Pontifex duplex hoc officium distinguit, sermonis videlicet habendi, quem vulgo Evangelii

explicationem vocitant, et christianae doctrinae tradendae. Non enim fortasse desint qui, minuendi laboris cupidi, persuadeant sibi homiliam pro cathechesi esse posse. Quod quam putetur perperam, consideranti patet. Qui enim sermo de sacro Evangelio habetur ad eos instituitur, quos fidei elementis imbutos iam esse oportet. Panem diceres, qui adultis frangatur. Catechetica e contra institutio lac illud est, quod Petrus Apostolus concupisci sine dolo a fidelibus volebat, quasi a modo genitis infantibus. Hoc scilicet catechistae munus est, veritatem aliquam tractandam suscipere vel ad fidem vel ad christianos mores pertinentem, eamque omni ex parte illustrare: quoniam vero emendatio vitae finis docendi esse debet, oportet catechistam comparationem instituere ea inter quae Deus agenda praecipit quaeque homines reapse agunt; post haec, exemplis opportune usum, quae vel e Scripturis sacris, vel ex Ecclesiastica historia, vel e sanctorum virorum vita sapineter hauserit, suadere auditores eisque, intento veluti digito, commonstrate quo pacto componant mores; finem denique hortando facere, ut qui adstant horreant vitia ac declinent, virtutem sectentur.

Scimus equidem eiusmodi tradendae christianae doctrina munus haud paucis invidiosum esse, quod minoris vulgo aestimetur nec forte ad popularem laudem captandam aptum. Nos tamen hoc esse iudicium eorum censemus, qui levitate magis quam veritate ducuntur. Oratores profecto Sacros, qui, sincero divinae gloriae studio, vel vindicandae tuendaeque fidei, vel Sanctorum laudationibus dent operam, probandos esse non recusamus. Verum illorum labor laborem alium praevium desiderat, scilicet catechistarum; qui si deest, fundamenta desunt, atque in vanum laborant qui aedificant domum. Nimium saepe orationes ornatissimae, quae confertissimae concionis plausu excipiuntur, hoc unum assequuntur ut pruriant auribus; animos nullatenus movent. E contra catechetica institutio humilis quamvis et simplex, verbum, illud est, de quo Deus ipse testatur pm Isaiam: "Quomodo descendit imber, et nix de caelo, et illuc ultra non revertitur, sed inebriat terram, et infundit eam, et germinare eam facit, et dat semen serenti, et panem comedenti: sic erit verbum meum quod egredietur de ore meo: non revertetur ad me vacuum, sed faciet quaecumque voluit, et prosperabitur in his, ad quae misi illud." (Is. lv., 10-11.) Similiter arbitrandum putamus de sacerdotibus, iis, qui, ad religionis veritates illustrandas, libros operosos conscribunt; digni plane que ideo commendatione multa exornentur. Quotus tamen quisque est, qui eiusmodi volumina verset, fructumque inde hauriat auctorum labori atque optatis respondentem? Traditio autem christianae doctrinae, si rite fiat, utilitatem audientibus nunquam non affert.

Etenim (quod ad inflammandum studium ministrorum Dei iterum

advertisse iuverit) ingens modo eorum est numerus atque in dies augetur, qui de religione omnino ignorant, vel eam tantum de Deo christianeque fidei notitiam habent, quae illos permittat, in media luce catholicae veritatis, idololatrarum more vivere. Quam multi eheu! sunt, non pueros dicimus, sed adulta, quin etiam devexa aetate, qui praecipua fidei mysteria nesciant prorsus; qui Christi nomine audito, respondeant: "Quis est, . . . ut credam in eum?" (Ioan. ix., 36.) Hinc odia in alios struere ac nutrire, pactiones conflare iniquissimas, inhonestas negotiorum procurationes gerere, aliena gravi foenore occupare, aliaque id genus flagitiosa haud sibi vitio ducunt. Hinc Christi legem ignorantes, quae non modo turpia damnat facinora, sed vel ea cogitare scienter atque optare; etsi forte, qualibet demum de causa, obscoenis voluptatibus fere abstinent, inquinatissimas tamen cogitationes, nulla sibi religione iniecta, suscipiunt; iniquitates super capillos capitis multiplicantes. Haec porro, iterasse iuvat, non in agris solum vel inter miseram plebeculam occurrunt, verum etiam ac forte frequentius inter homines amplioris ordinis, atque adeo apud illos quos inflat scientia, qui vana freti eruditione religionem ridere posse autumant et "quaecumque quidem ignorant, blasphemant." (Iud. x.)

Iam, si frustra seges e terra speratur quae semen non exceperit, quî demum bene moratas progenies expectes, si non tempore fuerint christiana doctrina institutae? Ex quo colligimus iure, quum fides id aetatis usque eo languerit ut in multis pene sint intermortua, sacrae catechesis tradendae officium vel negligentius persolvi, vel praetermitti omnino. Perperam enim ad habendam excusationem quis dixerit, esse fidem gratuito munere donatam nobis atque in sacro baptismate cuique inditam. Equidem utique quotquot in Christo baptizati sumus fidei habitu augemur; sed divinissimum hoc semen non "ascendit . . . et facit ramos magnos" (Marc. iv., 32) permissum sibi ac veluti virtute insita. Est et in homine, ab exortu, intelligendi vis: ea tamen materno indiget verbo, quo quasi excitata in actum, ut aiunt, exeat. Haud aliter christiano homini accidit, qui, renascens ex aqua et Spiritu Sancto, conceptam secum affert fidem; eget tamen Ecclesiae institutione, ut ea ali augerique possit fructumque ferre. Idcirco Apostolus scribebat: "Fides ex auditu, auditus autem per verbum Christi" (Rom. x., 17); institutionis autem necessitudinem ut ostenderet, addit: "Quomodo . . . audient sine praedicante?" (Rom. xiv.)

Quod si, ex huc usque explicatis, religiosa populi eruditio quanti momenti maxime esse oportet, ut Doctrinae sasit ostenditur, curae Nobis quam quod crae praeceptio, qua, ut Benedicti XIV. decessoris Nostri verbis utamur, ad Dei gloriam et ad animarum salutem nihil utilius est institutum (Constit. "Etsi minime," 13) vigeat semper aut,

sicubi negligitur, restituatur. Volentes igitur, Venerabiles Fratres, huic gravissimo supremi apostolatus officio satisfacere, atque unum paremque morem in re tanta ubique esse; suprema Nostra auctoritate, quae sequuntur, in dioecesibus uniaersis, observanda et exequenda constituimus districteque mandamus.

I. Parochi universi, ac generatim quotquot animarum curam gerunt, diebus dominicis ac festis per annum, nullo excepto, per integrum horae spatium, pueros et puellas de iis, quae quisque credere agereque debeant ad salutem adipiscendam, ex catechismi libello erudiant.

II. Iidem, statis anni temporibus pueros ac puellas ad Sacramenta Poenitentiae et Confirmationis rite suscipienda praeparent, continenti per dies plures institutione.

III. Item, ac peculiari omnino studio, feriis omnibus Quadragesimae atque aliis, si opus erit, diebus post festa Paschalia, aptis praeceptionibus et hortationibus adoloscentulos et adoloscentulas sic instruant, ut sancte primum de altari libent.

IV. In ombnibus et singulis paroeciis consociatio canonice instituatur, cui vulgo nomen Congregatio Doctrinae christianae. Eâ parochi, praesertim ubi sacerdotum numerus sit exiguus, adiutores in catechesi tradenda laicos habebunt, qui se huic dedent magisterio tum studio gloriae Dei, tum ad sacras lucrandas indulgentias, quas Romani Pontifices largissime tribuerunt.

V. Maioribus in urbibus, inque iis praecipue ubi universitates studiorum, lycea, gymnasia patent, scholae religionis fundentur ad erudiendam fidei veritatibus vitaeque christianae institutis iuventam, quae publicas scholas celebrat, ubi religiosae rei mentio nulla iniicitur.

VI. Quoniam vero, hac praesertim tempestate, grandior aetas non secus ac puerilis religiosa eget institutione; parochi universi ceterique animarum curam gerentes, praeter consuetam homiliam de Evangelio, quae festis diebus omnibus in parochiali Sacro est habenda, eâ horâ quam opportuniorem duxerint ad populi frequentiam, illâ tantum exceptâ qua pueri erudiuntur, catechesim ad fideles instituant, facili quidem sermone et ad captum accommodato. Qua in re Catechisma Tridentino utentur, eo utique ordine ut quadriennii vel quinquennii spatio totam materiam pertractent quae de Symbolo est, de Sacramentis, de Decalogo, de Oratione et de praeceptis Ecclesiae.

Haec Nos quidem, Venerabiles Fratres, auctoritate apostolica constituimus et iubemus. Vestrum modo erit efficere ut, in vestra cuiusque dioecesi, nullâ morâ atque integre executioni mandentur; vigilare porro et pro auctoritate vestra cavere, ne quae praecipimus oblivioni dentur, vel, quod idem est, remisse oscitanterque im-

pleantur. Quod ut reapse vitetur, illud assidue commendetis et urgeatis oportet, ut parochi ne imparati catechesis praeceptiones habeant, sed diligenti prius adhibita praeparatione; ut ne loquantur humanae sapientiae verba, sed, "in simplicitate cordis et sinceritate Dei," (II. Cor. i., 12), Christi exemplum sectentur, qui quamvis "abscondita" eructaret "a constitutione mundi" (Matth. xiii., 35), loquebatur tamen omnia "in parabolis ad turbas et sine parabolis non loquebatur eis." (Matth. xiii., 34.) Id ipsum et Apostolos, a Domino institutos, praestitisse novimus; de quibus Gregorius Magnus aiebat: "Curaverunt summopere rudibus populis plana, et capabilia non summa atque ardua praedicare." (Moral. I. xvii., cap. 26.) Ad religionem autem quod attinet, homines magnam partem radibus, hac tempestate nostra sunt accensendi.

Nolimus porro, ne ex eiusmodi simplicitatis studio persuadeat quis sibi, in hoc genere tractando, nullo labore nullaque meditatione opus esse: quin immo maiorem plane, quam quodvis genus aliud, requirit. Facilius longe est reperire oratorem, qui copiose dicat ac splendide, quam catechistam qui praeceptionem habeat omni ex parte laudabilem. Quamcumque igitur facilitatem cogitandi et eloquendi quis a natura sit nactus, hoc probe teneat, nunquam se de christiana doctrina ad pueros vel ad populum cum animi fructu esse dicturum, nisi multa commentatione paratum atque expeditum. Falluntur sane qui plebis imperitia ac tarditate fisi, hac in re negligentius agere se posse autumant. E contrario, quo quis rudiores nactus sit auditores, eo maiore studio ad diligentia utatur oportet, ut sublimissimas veritates, adeo a vulgari intelligentia remotas, ad obtusiorem imperitorum aciem accommodent, quibus aeque ac sapientibus, ad aeternam beatitatem adipiscendam sunt necessariae.

Iam igitur, Venerabiles Fratres, Mosis verbis, in hac postrema litterarum Nostrarum parte, liceat vos alloqui: "Si quis est Domini, iungatur mihi." (Exod. xxxii., 26.) Advertite, rogamus quaesumusque, quanta animarum clades ex una divinarum rerum ignoratione veniat. Multa forte utilia planque laudatione digna, in vestra cuiusque dioecesi, sunt a vobis instituta in commissi gregis commodum: velitis tamen, prae omnibus, quanta potestis contentione, quanto studio, quanta potestis contentione, quanto studio, quanta assiduitate hoc curare atque urgere, ut doctrinae christianae notitia cunctorum pervadat animos penitusque imbuat. "Unusquisque," Petri Apostoli utimur verbis, "sicut accepit gratiam, in alterutrum illam administrantes, sicut boni dispensatores multiformis gratiae Dei." (I. Petr. iv., 10.)

Diligentiam industriasque vestras, beatissima Virgine immaculata intercedente, fortunet vobis Apostolica benedictio, quam, testem

caritatis Nostrae ac caelestium gratiarum auspicem, vobis et clero ac populo cuique credito amantissime impertimus.

Datum Romae, apud Sanctum Petrum die XV. Aprilis MDCCCCV., Pontificatus Nostri anno secundo.

PIUS PP. X.

THE TEACHING OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.

ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF PIUS X., BY DIVINE PROVIDENCE POPE, TO THE SACRED BISHOPS OF THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH ON THE TEACHING OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.

TO HIS VENERABLE BROTHERS, THE PATRIARCHS, PRIMATES, ARCHBISHOPS, BISHOPS AND OTHER ORDINARIES HAVING PEACE AND UNION WITH THE APOSTOLIC SEE, PIUS P. P. X. SENDS GREETING AND BENEDICTION.

Venerable Brothers:

IN THIS extremely distressing and difficult time the hidden designs of God have imposed on our slender strength the office of Supreme Pastor over the universal flock of Christ. The hardship is great because the enemy has long been prowling around the flock and with subtle cunning has endeavored to bring havoc upon it, succeeding to such an extent that more than ever what the Apostle wrote to the ancients of the Church of Ephesus seems to be realized: "I know that ravening wolves will enter among you, not sparing the flock." (Acts xx., 29.)

Those among us who are prompted by zeal for the glory of God and who seek for the reasons of the present decay of religion ascribe it to various causes, and each, according to his own views, adopts different methods in the endeavor to protect and restore the kingdom of God on earth. To us, Venerable Brethren, without rejecting the opinions of others, it seems we must agree with the judgment of those who attribute the remissness, or rather the intellectual debility of our times—a condition from which such grave evils arise—chiefly to ignorance of divine things. There seems in our days to be a recurrence of what God said by the mouth of the Prophet Osee: "There is no knowledge of God in the land. Cursing and lying and killing and theft have overflowed and blood hath touched blood. Therefore shall the land mourn, and every one that dwelleth in it shall languish." (Osee iv., 1.)

In fact, in our age it is a common and alas! not an unjust complaint that there are a great many Christian people who are in the densest ignorance about what concerns their eternal salvation. Nor when we say Christian people do we refer to the humbler classes, who often may find an excuse for their ignorance in the fact that the hard rule of their harsh masters does not leave them the opportunity to attend to themselves or permit the disposal of their time; but we speak especially of those who are not lacking in intellectual culture, nay, who are often notably conspicuous for knowledge in profane science, but who in religious matters pass their lives in thoughtlessness and unconcern. It is difficult to explain in what dense darkness they are involved, and, what is worse, in what heedlessness they live. Of God, the Supreme Ruler and Author of all things, of the teaching of Christianity they have never a thought. They know nothing of the Incarnation; nothing of God's perfect renovation of the human race; nothing of grace, which is especially required for the attainment of things eternal; nothing of the august Sacrifice of the Mass, or of the sacraments by which we acquire and retain divine grace. Of the wickedness and foulness of sin they have no appreciation, and hence no care to avoid or to withdraw from it; and they arrive at the portals of death in such a condition that the priest, not to dispel all hope of salvation, is compelled to sum up and teach the very elements of religious truth, instead of devoting those last moments to fostering sentiments of love of God in the soul. Often it is not even that, and, as too frequently happens, the dying man in his reprehensible ignorance regards the ministrations of the priest as unnecessary, and persuades himself that he can enter on the dreadful road of eternity with a tranquil mind and face the anger of God, whom he has not thought it necessary to propitiate. Fittingly has it been said by our predecessor, Benedict XIV.: "We declare that the greater part of those who are damned have brought the calamity on themselves by ignorance of the mysteries of the faith, which they should have known and believed, in order to be united with the elect."

Hence, Venerable Brothers, why should we wonder that not only among savage peoples, but even in those nations which are still spoken of as Christian, there should be such a widespread and ever-increasing corruption of morals and depravity of life? The Apostle Paul, writing to the Ephesians, said: "Fornication, and all uncleanness and covetousness, let it not be so much as named among you, as becomes saints; or obscenity or foolish talking." (Eph. cv., 3.)

Now, the foundation of this holiness and purity of soul, which are to hold evil desires in check, is, as the Apostle declared, the

knowledge of divine things: "See, therefore, brethren, how you walk circumspectly, not as unwise, but as wise. Therefore become not unwise, but understanding what is the will of God." (Eph. cv., 15.)

And rightly so. For the will of man now scarcely retains even that love of right and justice which was implanted in the human heart by the Almighty Creator, and which was intended to lead to what is the true good, and not to what is only a shadow. Depraved by the primal fault and forgetful of God, its Maker, it directs everything to the cultivation of vanity and the pursuit of falsehood. Blinded by wicked desires, there is surely need of a guide to lead it in the ways of justice which have been unfortunately abandoned.

Of course the natural guide is the human mind, but if the mind has not its proper light, viz.: the knowledge of divine things, it will be the blind leading the blind, ending only in the ditch. The holy King David, praising God for the light of truth with which He had illumined the intellect, exclaimed: "The light of Thy countenance, O Lord, is signed upon us." And he signified what was to follow upon the possession of this gift of light when he added: "Thou hast given gladness in my heart" (Ps. iv., 7); to wit, that gladness with which the heart is dilated when it runs in the ways of God's commandments.

Whosoever considers this will perceive how true it is that Christian truth, more perfectly than the mere powers of nature, shows us the nature of God and His infinite perfections.

Why should it not be so? Christian truth bids us revere Almighty God by faith, which is an act of the mind; by hope, which is an act of the will; by charity, which is an act of the heart, and thus it subjects the whole man to its Supreme Author and Ruler. In the same way the doctrine of Jesus Christ unfolds for us the true nobility of human nature, inasmuch as it reveals man as the son of the Heavenly Father, after whose likeness he is made, and holds out to him an eternal and glorious reward. But from this very dignity with which man is invested and from the knowledge of it, Christ wishes us to learn that we should love one another and live as behooves the sons of light, "not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chamberings and impurities, not in contention and envy." (Rom. xiii., 13.)

He likewise enjoins upon us to cast all our care upon God, knowing that He will provide for us. He bids us give to the poor, to do good to those who hate us, to place the eternal advantage of our soul above the fleeting pleasures of this world. And, not to speak of all these things in detail, does not the teaching of Christ appeal to and command the proud to cultivate that humility of

soul which is the origin of true glory? "Whoever, therefore, shall humble himself he is the greater in the kingdom of heaven." (Matth. xvii., 4.) It teaches us that prudence of the spirit which wards off the prudence of the flesh; that justice which gives each his own; that fortitude which makes us ready to bear all things, and with resolute heart to suffer for God and our eternal happiness. Finally it teaches that temperance by which we even love poverty for the sake of the kingdom of God, nay, by which we "glory in the cross of Christ, despising the shame." Hence it follows that not only does Christian teaching illumine the mind and enable it to attain the truth, but it inflames the will and enkindles that ardor which makes us aspire to God and unite ourselves with Him by the exercise of every virtue.

It is not our purpose to assert that depravity of the heart is inconsistent with knowledge of religious truth. Would that facts did not prove the contrary! But we say that where the mind is enveloped in the dark clouds of ignorance, there cannot be either rectitude or morality. For although a man with eyes open can turn away from the right path, the blind man is constantly in danger of going wrong. Moreover, whereas if the light of faith is not wholly extinct, there is always a hope of reformation; depravity of morals, united with ignorance of the truth, leaves scarcely any remedy and leaves the road open that leads to ruin.

Since therefore so many and such serious evils result from ignorance, and since, on the other hand, there is such need of and such helpfulness in religious instruction, it is in vain for any one to hope to fulfill his duty unless he knows what that duty is. Upon whom the task devolves to do away with this fatal ignorance and to impart to men's minds the knowledge which it is so necessary to possess, let us now stop to consider.

On whom it devolves, Venerable Brothers, admits of no doubt; for this most important duty regards all who are charged with the care of souls. They are bound by the precept of Christ to know and feed the flock intrusted to them. But to feed is, first of all, to teach: "I will give you"—thus God promised by Jeremias—"pastors according to my own heart, and they shall feed you with knowledge and doctrine." (Jerem. iii., 15.) Wherefore Paul the Apostle said, "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel" (Cor. i., 17), indicating that the first duty of those who in any degree are set over the government of the Church is the instruction of the faithful in sacred things.

We deem it superfluous to dwell at greater length in praising such instruction, or showing its value in the eyes of God. No doubt the pity we manifest in relieving the wants of the poor is most accept-

able to God; but who will question that the care and labor by which we procure, not transient benefits for the body, but eternal for souls by teaching and warning them, are far more acceptable. Nothing, certainly, can be more desirable, nothing more pleasing to Jesus Christ, the Redeemer of immortal souls, who said of Himself by Isaias, "He hath sent me to preach the Gospel to the poor." (St. Luke iv., 18.)

It is important, Venerable Brothers, to emphasize and urge this in a particular manner, that no weightier duty is appointed unto priests, and by no stricter obligations are they bound. In a priest holiness of life must be accompanied by knowledge: "The lips of the priest shall keep knowledge" (Mal. ii., 7); and the Church strongly insists upon it for those who are about to enter the sacred ministry. Wherefore does she so insist? Because the Christian people expect from them the knowledge of the Divine law, and God chooses them to impart it: "They shall seek the law at his mouth; because he is the Angel of the Lord of hosts." (Mal. ii., 7.) On this account the Bishop at ordination thus addresses the candidates for the priesthood: "Let your doctrine be the spiritual medicine of the people of God; let them be provident helpers of our order; that, meditating upon the law day and night, they may believe what they read, and teach what they have believed." (Pontif Rom.) If these words apply to all priests, what must be the thought of those who, having official rank and power, are charged with the government of souls by virtue of their priestly dignity and, as it were by a sacred contract! They are the pastors and doctors whom Christ hath given that the faithful be no longer children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine by the wickedness of men; but by doing the truth in charity, they may in all things grow up in Him who is the Head, even Christ. (Ephes. iv., 14-15.)

Wherefore the holy Council of Trent, considering the pastors of souls, declared that their first and chief duty was to teach the faithful of Christ. Hence it commands them to explain the truths of religion to the people at least on Sundays and more solemn festivals, and every day, or certainly three times a week, in the sacred seasons of Advent and Lent. Nor is this all, for it adds that parish priests are bound, at least on these same Sundays and festivals, either personally or by others, to instruct the children in the truths of faith, and to train them in obedience to God and their parents. When, moreover, the sacraments are to be administered, it orders that those who are to receive them be instructed in plain and simple language regarding their effects.

These prescriptions of the holy Synod Benedict XIV., our predecessor, thus summarized and defined more distinctly in his Con-

stitution *Etsi minime:* "Two duties particularly are imposed by the Council of Trent on the guardians of souls: one, that they should speak to the people about Divine things on festival days; the other that they should instruct children and all less intelligent persons in the rudiments of faith and of the Divine Law." Rightly, indeed, does the prudent Pontiff distinguish the twofold office: of delivering an address—which is usually called an explanation of the Gospel—and of teaching Christian doctrine. For there may not be wanting some who, for the sake of lessening labor, may persuade themselves that the homily may take the place of catechism—a mistake evident to all who reflect. The sermon on the Gospel is addressed to those who have been already imbued with the elements of the faith. It may be called the bread distributed to grown people. Catechetical teaching, on the contrary, is the milk which the Apostle Peter wished the people to desire without guile. That is to say, the office of the catechist consists in taking up for explanation a truth pertaining to faith or morals, and making it clear from every point of view. And since the purpose of teaching should be amendment of life, the catechist must institute a comparison between what God commands to be done and what men do in point of fact; then, making timely use of examples drawn from the Sacred Scriptures, ecclesiastical history, or the lives of the saints, he must persuade his hearers, and point out to them clearly how they are to set their conduct in order; finally, let him exhort all present to abhor and fly vice and to pursue a virtuous life.

We understand, indeed, that such a duty as this of teaching Christian doctrine is unattractive to not a few as not being generally held in high estimation, nor perhaps likely to attract popular praise. But for our part, we consider that such an opinion is founded rather on thoughtlessness than truth. Sacred orators, who, from a sincere desire of glorifying God, justify and defend the faith, or proclaim the glories of the saints, are certainly to be praised. But this work supposes a preceding one; that, namely, of the catechist; which, if it has been omitted, the foundations on which to build the house have not been laid. Too often do the most ornate discourses, which receive the loud applause of crowded assemblages, serve only to tickle men's ears, without at all moving their hearts. Catechetical instruction, on the other hand, although unpretentious and simple, is that word to which God Himself witnesseth by Isaias: "As the rain and the snow come down from heaven and return no more thither, but soak the earth and water it, and make it to spring and give seed to the sower and bread to the eater; so shall my word be, which shall go forth from my mouth: it shall not return to me void, but it shall do whatsoever I please, and shall

prosper in the things for which I sent it." (Isa. lv., 10-11.) A like opinion should we form of those priests who laboriously write books in defense of the truths of religion: They are certainly worthy of much praise. But how many persons will study these volumes and draw profit from them commensurate with the author's labor and desires? Whereas, the explanation of Christian doctrine, if it be duly given, is never fruitless for the hearers.

It will further inflame the zeal of the ministers of God to recall the enormous and constantly increasing number of persons who either know nothing at all of religion, or who have only such a knowledge of God and of the Christian faith that, in the midst of the light of Catholic truth, they lead the lives of idolaters. How many, alas! there are, not children merely, but adults, who, even at an advanced age, are entirely unacquainted with the principal mysteries of the faith; who, when they hear the name of Christ, ask "Who is He that I may believe in Him?" (St. John ix., 36.) Hence it is that they foment hatred between men; they form criminal associations; they engage in dishonest business; they usuriously seize the property of others, and consider these and similar things no crime. Hence, ignoring the law of Christ, which condemns not only unclean deeds, but thoughts also and desires, although refraining perhaps, for one reason or another, from obscene pleasures, they reject no sinful thought. There being no religion in their hearts, their sins are multiplied beyond the hairs of their heads. These things, in truth, it is well to remember, occur not merely among the rude and wretched, but also, and perhaps more frequently, among persons of loftier station, and amongst those whom science inflates, who, in the conceit of vain learning, deem religion a thing to be laughed at and "blaspheme whatever things they know not." (St. Jude i., 10.)

Now if a harvest is vainly expected from ground which has received no seed, how shall we look for good morals in a generation which has not received Christian instruction? Wherefore, we justly conclude that since faith has so languished that in many persons it seems to be dying, the duty of catechetical instruction must have been negligently performed or altogether omitted. It is but a false excuse to pretend that faith is a gratuitous gift conferred on each one in baptism. All who are baptized in Christ do indeed receive the habit of faith; but this divinest seed does not "grow up and shoot out great branches" (St. Mark iv., 32) by its own innate power. As there is in man from birth the faculty of understanding, which needs the mother's promptings to develop into efficiency, so it does not happen otherwise to the Christian, who, born anew of water and the Holy Ghost, is imbued with faith.

He needs Christian formation, that faith may be fostered and may increase and bear fruit. Hence the Apostle wrote: "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of Christ." (Rom. x., 17.) But that he might show the necessity of teaching, he added, "How shall they hear without a preacher?"

If therefore, from all that has been hitherto said, it is clear of what importance is the religious training of the people, it should be our greatest concern that the teaching of Christian doctrine, than which, to use the words of our predecessor, Benedict XIV., nothing more useful has been instituted, should always be vigorously maintained, and where it has fallen into disuse restored.

Therefore, Venerable Brothers, wishing to satisfy the weighty obligations of our high and apostolic office, and desiring to see uniformity of custom everywhere established in so important a matter, we do decree and strictly command that in all dioceses throughout the world the following regulations be observed and enforced:

I. All parish priests, and in general all to whom the care of souls is committed, must teach the catechism to their young boys and girls for the space of one hour on all Sundays and holy days of the year without exception; explaining to them what each is bound to believe and practise in order to attain eternal salvation.

II. They shall also at stated times in the year carefully prepare these children for the Sacraments of Penance and Confirmation by courses of instruction extending through many days.

III. Likewise, by means of appropriate instructions and exhortations, given every day during the Lenten season, and if necessary also after Easter, they shall, but with very particular care and diligence, prepare their young people of both sexes for a worthy reception of their first Holy Communion.

IV. Let there be canonically established in every parish the association commonly known as the Society of Christian Doctrine, by means of which, especially where the number of priests is small, pastors may secure lay help in the teaching of catechism; and these lay teachers should apply themselves to their task out of zeal for the glory of God, as well as from a desire to gain the rich indulgences lavishly granted by the Roman Pontiffs.

V. In the larger cities, especially where there are public academies, colleges and universities, let religious doctrine classes be established for the purpose of teaching the truths of our faith and the precepts of Christian morality to the youths who attend such public institutions wherein no mention whatsoever is made of religion.

VI. And since, in our times especially, those more advanced in years stand in no less need of religious instruction than do the

young, all pastors and others having the care of souls shall, on Sundays and holy days, and at an hour most convenient for the majority of the faithful, instruct them in the catechism, using plain and simple language, adapted to their intelligence. This, moreover, is in addition to the usual homily on the Gospel prescribed for the parish Mass, and the hour chosen should not conflict with that of the children's instruction. The catechism of the Council of Trent should be followed in all these instructions, which ought to be so ordered as to cover in the space of four or five years the entire matter of the Apostles' Creed, the Sacraments, the Ten Commandments, Prayer and the Precepts of the Church.

All this, Venerable Brethren, we determine and decree by our apostolic authority; it will now be your duty, each in his own diocese, to put it into effect immediately and in every detail.

Moreover, it will be incumbent upon you to be vigilant in this matter, using your authority unto the end that what we now enjoin be not overlooked and forgotten, or, what would be as bad, that it be not put into effect negligently and listlessly. Indeed, if you would prevent such a result, you must constantly exhort and urge your pastors not to attempt these catechetical instructions offhand, but rather to prepare for them with the utmost care; for thus they will not discourse in the words of human wisdom, but "in simplicity of heart and the sincerity of God." (II. Cor. i., 12.) Let them take pattern by Christ Himself, who though uttering "things hidden from the foundation of the world" (Matt. xiii., 35), nevertheless declared all things "in parables to the multitudes; and without parables He did not speak to them." (Matt. xiii., 34.) We know, too, that the Apostles who were trained by Our Lord did the same; and St. Gregory the Great used to say that "their greatest care was to preach to the simple people the plainest truths, things not high and lofty, but such as they could easily comprehend." (Moral I., xvii., chapter 26.) And in matters of religion it is no different in our day; most men are to be moved and won by what is most simple and direct.

Now it would be a mistake, and far from our intention, were any one to conclude from what we have said about this striving after simplicity in religious instruction, that such manner of discourse calls for no effort, no thoughtful preparation. On the contrary, it demands much more than any other kind of public speaking. Far easier is it to find an orator who can deliver an elaborate and brilliant sermon than a catechist able to give a simple but flawless instruction. Therefore, however much one may be gifted by nature with ease in composition or fluency of expression, let him nevertheless be persuaded of this—that he will never derive any real

fruit for souls from his instructions on Christian doctrine to children or to the people, unless he has well prepared himself by long and careful study and meditation. It is a grievous mistake to count on the people's ignorance or slowness of comprehension, and use this as an excuse for negligence in the matter of preparation. The fact is, that the less cultured one's audience, the greater care and pains must be taken to bring within the reach of their feebler comprehension truths the most sublime and far above the reach of the ordinary intelligence—yet truths as necessary to salvation for the ignorant as for the learned.

And now, Venerable Brethren, before closing this letter, we shall address to you the words of Moses: "If any man be on the Lord's side, let him join with me." (Exod. xxxii., 26.) Consider well, we entreat and beseech you, what a loss to souls arises from this one cause, ignorance of the things of God. There may doubtless be many useful and praiseworthy works established in your diocese for the good of the flock entrusted to you, yet it should be your desire and ambition, before all else, to urge this present matter with all possible zeal and insistence, to work for and promote this one great end—that knowledge of Christian doctrine may thoroughly pervade and imbue the minds of all the faithful. In the words of the Apostle St. Peter: "As every man hath received grace, ministering the same one to another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God." (I. Peter iv., 10.)

And while the Most Blessed and Immaculate Virgin will continually intercede for the success of your earnest and zealous efforts, they shall also be favored by our Apostolic Benediction, which we lovingly impart to yourselves, to your clergy and to the faithful under your care, both as a testimony of our affection and as a pledge of heavenly graces.

PIUS X., Pope.

St. Peter's, Rome, April 15, 1905, in the second year of our Pontificate.

THE SCHILLER CENTENARY: "DON CARLOS."

THIS is the Schiller centenary year, and it is also the tercentenary year of Cervantes. No other two writers have had a greater share in fashioning the modern spirit than these. Cervantes' renowned book secured for the author immortality, while it demolished the grand edifice of knightly chivalry. Spain's glory and magnificence grew out of the ideas embodied in that cult; her decline dates from the day when the first edition of "Don Quixote" was given to the world. This was not the deliberate intention of the gifted author. He was a paragon of chivalry himself, in an unpretentious sort of way. He saw, however, the ludicrous side of things more clearly than the grave Spanish dons of his day appear to have seen them. Many conceits were set down in the old books on chivalry, and many things were done by the devotees of chivlary which to that mirth-loving observer seemed the acme of solemn fooling. It needed only to offset them with the homely wit and the practical philosophy of the ordinary man-at-arms, the knight's body servant, using his privilege of speaking out freely, like the court jesters of an earlier day, to make the world see the anachronism of knightly etiquette at a time when knighthood had outlived its uses in the world's economy. Despite the fact that Cervantes, in the view of a good many people, did a disservice to Spain by lowering her ideals, his memory was publicly honored this year throughout the country as it never was before. Feasting, pageantry illustrative of his characters, oratory and music marked the celebration in Madrid and many other cities. Only the genius of the author was remembered; the effects of his work were forgotten for the hour. The lustre he had shed upon the literature of the country, rich as it was ere he arose, in great writers, was the fact that the whole nation strove to acknowledge with fitting honor; a practical application of the *de mortuis* maxim that few other peoples or individuals have exhibited.

In the case of the Schiller centenary another era of change was celebrated—change of a different order and far wider manifestations. Schiller was the poet and the prophet of the new social ideal. The germ of the modern socialistic philosophy is found in his writings—in his play of "The Robbers" especially. In this play, which was written before the author was eighteen, is found a complete disproof that knowledge of the world and mankind at large, in its various phases and idiosyncrasies, is indispensable to poet, dramatist and novelist. Schiller knew nothing of the world beyond the limits of his little native town of Marbach, in Würtemberg, and nothing of mankind beyond his own household and the obscure

school wherein he derived his elementary learning and his military drill. But reading supplied what experience should have given. He devoted every hour he could snatch from the iron rule of the pedagogue, and gain by strategy, to the study of books. It was an auspicious time for his purpose. German literature was then at its best, before he appeared to give it the finishing glory. He had Klöpstock, Göethe, Müller, Gerstenberg, Lessing and several other great authors, in poetry and drama, to regale himself with. He had beside Wieland's translation of Shakespeare. These he fed on until he was enabled, with the help of a little knowledge of the petty political and social tyranny of which the smaller German States were the theatre at the time—and some of the greater ones, too—to create for himself a world wherein these trammels could find illustration in the actions of individuals and appeal to the instincts of freedom and generosity to work for their amelioration. Thus was "The Robbers" surreptitiously created. It stirred Germany to the core when it was first presented on the stage, for it gave voice to the spirit of discontent then seething in many breasts. It caused the author to be imprisoned for a fortnight by his own local tyrant, the Duke of Würtemberg. He forbade Schiller to write any more plays. But the poet was of a different mind. He made his way stealthily out of his duchy and got into Bauerbach, which was beyond his territory; and there he was free to pursue the study of letters and poetry to his heart's content. One of his first plays written in that retreat held up to the world's scorn the despicable action of that Landgrave of Hesse who sold his subjects to England to fight the American revolutionists, simply that he might have money to spend on his mistresses and his stomach and his stable-boys. This play was called "Cabal and Love." Those who would gain a knowledge of the actual condition of those petty German principalities in Schiller's day will find all they need in that way by turning to the pages of Thackeray. "The Four Georges" gives a lifelike picture of their meanness, their brutality, their beastliness, in the first two books.

These works established Schiller's fame at an age rarely found developing great genius. They were both written before he was of legal age, there is reason to believe. In this respect there is considerable resemblance between some of the greatest poets. Elizabeth Barrett Browning wrote much of her best work at a very early period of girlhood, so did Felicia Hemans. Byron, Moore and Shelley also produced some remarkably fine work in their minority days. Schiller was born in 1759, and his "Robbers" was being played at Mannheim in 1782. He had taken out a degree as M. D. in 1780, but he had written his play three years before he could

succeed in getting it accepted for stage representation. In 1783 he wrote "Cabal and Love," likewise another play called "The Conspiracy of Fiesco." About the same time he resumed the writing of a work begun much earlier, the tragedy of "Don Carlos." This work was founded on an earlier one, a novel, published in Paris by the Abbé Saint Réal in 1672. It is with this work more than with Schiller's own career and general work that this article is concerned. Several other writers have taken the tragic story of Don Carlos for a theme, either for dramatic treatment or otherwise. A modern Spanish writer has used it in a play called "El Haz de Lena" ("The Bundle of Fagots"). The *Messenger* for June very properly administered a rebuke on the subject. The editor remarks: "A writer in the *School Review* tells us that Carlos was 'a degenerate, an oaf devoid of all claims to sympathy, a pitiable being infirm in body and mind and with the most bestial and depraved tastes,' all of which contradicts the popular myth that he was a much abused prince. That is all well enough, and has more or less truth in it; but when the writer explains that this degenerate is expiating the sins of a long line of vicious ancestors, and when we advert to the fact that his vicious ancestors were, first, Philip II., whom even the writer doesn't make out to be anything worse than 'a cold unrelenting but conscientious autocrat,' and then Charles V., and Ferdinand and Isabella, we have an example of how unconscious cerebration may sometimes lead a well intentioned writer to put down what is not in keeping with facts." Now, while it may be true that the unfortunate Crown Prince in question was "a degenerate," in a moral sense, it is only fair to explain that there was a physical reason for that fact, and that none of the writers who have made his story the subject of play or poem seem to have been aware of his real story. It was not until long after Schiller's death that the real facts were brought to light. It was a countryman of Schiller's, Friedrich von Raumer, a nobleman and a man of eminence in the domain of letters as well, who took the trouble to investigate all the documents bearing on the case of Don Carlos, and then had them published for the sake of truth. This was done in the year 1831, under the title "Letters from Paris Illustrative of the History of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries." The work is of the deepest historical interest. Before proceeding to examine the facts it adduces in relation to the life and death of the unhappy Prince, it is proper to glance at the other work performed by Schiller and at the character of the man himself, as presented by those who knew him best—his warm friend, Körner, the poet-soldier who wrote the famous "Song of the Sword," Göethe and others of high standing.

It was in 1786 that Schiller completed "Don Carlos." Next year he went to Weimar, where he became friendly with Herder and Wieland. The German men of letters of that day seem to have been free from the miserable rivalries and jealousies that too often mark literary people in other lands, for in their poems and correspondence are found many noble tributes to those brother workers who strove to elevate the literature of the Fatherland so as to make it voice the swelling aspirations of a great people held in thrall but struggling manfully for emancipation—for such was the case in the Germany of that epoch. Here, in Weimar, Schiller turned from poetry to the more sober Muse of history. He began a great work, "The History of the Revolt of the United Netherlands," and in 1788 this was completed and given to the world. In the year following he was honored by the University of Jena with a professorship in the faculty of philosophy. This appointment did not prevent him from pursuing his favorite art. In the three ensuing years he produced his most important historical work, the "History of the Thirty Years' War," and when this serious task was finished he turned his thoughts to lighter one—odes, essays on Kantean speculation, on æsthetic themes, hymns, amatory verses, ballads and finally his greatest lyrical work, "The Song of the Bell." These finished, the drama once again claimed his attention. In reading for his "Thirty Years' War" he had been forcibly struck with the great figure of Wallenstein, and he selected the character as the central one for the next play he was to write. The result of his study was the "Wallenstein Trilogy," as it is called—a great tragedy embracing three separate but interdependent plays. Swiftly following this operose production came others hardly less so—"Maria Stuart," "The Maid of Orleans," "The Bride of Messina" and "William Tell." "The Maid of Orleans" was of this great group the work that deserves the thanks of the world of truth and justice. Schiller raised the character of the sainted Joan into its proper place. He flung down the gross caricatures of Shakespeare and Voltaire, and placed the figure of the Maid, in all its glory and purity, before the gaze of mankind, in language befitting so sublime a work of justice. His "William Tell" is justly regarded as next to this drama in nobility of style and thought. He had the pleasure of seeing it worthily presented on the Berlin stage before he died. After he completed this play he did little more than collaborate with Göethe (whose friendship he had formed in 1795) in a series of epigrammatic satires called "Xenien," after the thirteenth book of Martial, the Roman satirist.

In 1802 Schiller's fame demanded recognition of the higher powers. He was raised to the rank of the nobility, although he

himself did not covet such a distinction; still for his children's sake he was glad to have it proffered. His parents had been of humble but worthy origin, and both were remarkable for piety and benevolence. His mother was intellectually far above her class and had a special fondness for reading poetical work—hence, perhaps, the son's great gift. She had a strong desire that he should be brought up as a theologian and enter the Church (the Lutheran), but his vocation, he found, did not lie in that direction; neither did it in that of medicine, nor that of the law, to both of which he turned in succession, but in the fascinating field which lures many unfit minds into a morass of disappointment and despair.

Schiller had married, in 1790, when he got his professorship at Jena, his wife being a lady called Charlotte von Lengefeld. He died in 1805—on the 9th of May—the day observed as the centenary. The lady survived him by twenty-one years. They had four children, two sons and two daughters, none of whom exhibited any of his great literary and poetical power. Like Raphael and Mozart, he passed away at an age when genius is at its full flower. His full name was Johann Christoph Friedrich Schiller.

The character of Schiller is of the highest. With all his great gifts he was thoroughly unaffected and honest. He is said to have been a little brusque at times, but men of genius have often shown thus, as when their mental apparatus is busy disturbance or interruption may be resented by even the most amiable. His portraits show us a handsome man, with firmness and judgment indicated in the lines of a finely-cut face, and generosity and pride in the eye and brow.

Schiller had to bear much of the duress of those who have to cultivate the Muses "on a little oatmeal," in his early days. Besides being persecuted by the little tyrants who ruled the German dovecots in his day, he was tried by poverty. Chill penury might have frozen his genius into inutility had he not found friends. Körner was his good angel. Affluence and a noble nature enabled him to befriend a less fortunate brother. He willingly shared his good fortune with one less favorably placed, when the price of the midnight oil was difficult to procure. Few figures among those whose fame Schiller celebrated in his undying verse command more admiration than the gallant young soldier-poet who roused his countrymen to repel foreign aggression and gave his chivalrous life to their service, singing as he fell.

It is rarely found that a great poet can also claim to be called a great historian. Schiller was one of those who possessed a just claim to such a distinction. His historical work is of greater value, in one sense, than his lyrical. He was conscientious, diligent and

sympathetic in his research and depiction of the great events which he undertook to spread before the eyes of mankind for its profit and instruction. The fact that he was a Lutheran, by profession, did not prejudice him when he came to deal with the Catholic side of history. In many passages of his prose writings there is a Catholic strain of thought discernible. This is a peculiarity of German writers of that epoch. Their thoughts were often reminiscent of the source whence their intellect was derived. Like fragments of a beautiful broken vase they spoke of the exquisite material of which they were originally compact and hinted at the grace which the parent form demonstrated in its configuration and embellishment.

Schiller's historical works distinctly exhibit the fact that the wars which ensued on the "Reformation" were political in their origin, for the most part. His horror of the scenes which religious fanaticism created, as the moral pestilence developed in the chief centres of European civilization, is strikingly expressed in many memorable passages. No Catholic historian could write more forcibly than he of the awful doings of the Iconoclasts in Holland. He describes in terms of unqualified horror how they burst into the churches, tore down the images of the Saviour on the cross and of the Virgin and the saints, and battered them into *débris* and how they scattered the Eucharistic wafers about the floor and trampled them under their muddy feet. These chapters of his history are blood-curdling. But, coming from a Protestant, they are useful.

Of what composition were the Iconoclasts? Schiller answers the question in a few graphic sentences. "A frantic band of artisans, boatmen and peasants, mixed with public prostitutes, beggars and thievish vagabonds, about three hundred in number, provided with clubs, axes, hammers, ladders and cords, only few among them furnished with firearms and daggers, cast themselves, inspired with fanatical fury, into the villages and hamlets near St. Omer; burst the gates of such churches and cloisters as they find locked, overthrow the altars, dash to pieces the images of the saints and trample them underfoot. Still more inflamed by this execrable deed, and reinforced by fresh accessions, they press forward straightway to Ypres, where they can count on a strong following of Calvinists. Unopposed they break into the Cathedral; the walls are mounted with ladders, the pictures are beaten into fragments with hammers, the pulpits and pews hewn to pieces with axes, the altars stripped of their ornaments and the sacred vessels stolen." The still more horrible sacrilege above referred to took place in Antwerp Cathedral, almost under the eyes of the Prince of Orange, who found himself powerless to restrain the lawless fury of the forces which

he led. In all his references to this demoniac work Schiller expresses profound abhorrence. In this he presents a pleasing contrast to other Protestant writers—Niebuhr for instance. He, scholar, historian and would-be philosopher, did not shrink from formulating the horrible theory that the Almighty uses the devil as an instrument of His purposes—a notion more blasphemous than even the Hussites' dual theory of good and evil powers. In a letter to his friend Savigny, dated at Bonn, 4th September, 1827, he puts it forward in palliation of the destructive work of the Iconoclasts. He wrote: "You must know there is now springing up in Germany a class who buy great books without intending to read them. For a long time we were too honest to do this, and hence, after the devil, in God's service, had put an end to the convents, which formerly used to buy ponderous works and lay them on their shelves, to lead a useless existence like those monks themselves, works of this magnitude could not be disposed of." The writer of this vile mixture of blasphemy and mendacity was a man of encyclopædic reading, who at one time affected to look down on Schiller, but after his death condescended to say that he had come to regard him more favorably than at first knowledge.

To return to Don Carlos. Schiller did not adopt the theory of degeneracy; the word was not known, in its scientific application, in his day. But his picture of the unhappy prince was drawn from fictitious sources; it was not until Raumer appeared on the scene that the true story of his life was disclosed. In all the long category of odious names there is none more obnoxious in the British ear than that of Philip the Second of Spain, chiefly because he represented the Catholicity that sought to meet the physical force of the Reformation by similar force. Therefore no effort was spared to make him appear a monster of cruelty and unnatural hatred. He has been held accountable for the death of his son by historians who had no opportunity to examine the evidence on the subject, but allowed their religious and political sympathies to take the place of such evidence. Carlos was known to sympathize with the people of the Netherlands, against whom his father was waging war; and this was enough to give a reason for his taking off, as in the case of the Duke of Monmouth and King James, and the similar tragedy of Alexis, the son of the Czar Peter. In the theory of monarchy rebellion against the sovereign, no matter by whom committed, involves the death penalty, how close soever the relationship.

Friedrich von Raumer went to Paris in 1830 for the express purpose of examining the historical documents bearing on this subject and collecting materials for another work on which he was en-

gaged. He was given every facility by the authorities. They threw open the precious archives of the Biblitoheque du Roi. Here were stored all the official correspondence relative to the acts of Kings and Queens, at home and abroad, ambassadorial reports of the most confidential character, diplomatic correspondence, and every kind of paper bearing on the subject of the court, the State and the government, from the earliest period that such records began to be kept in France. Such State papers are indispensable to the historian, since they enable him to correct many versions of great events long accepted as the true versions. Raumer was at first bewildered by the mass of materials thus placed at his disposal. But he found it all methodically classified and indexed, and so he had only to select the portion relative to the period with which he was immediately concerned to begin a systematic investigation in chronological and geographical order.

Carlos was the son of King Philip II. and his first wife, the Infanta Maria of Portugal. He was born in the year 1545. He was in infancy a sickly child, and he seems to have had a vicious temper—not by any means an unusual circumstance with boys. Vicious tempers are, in fact, so frequently found in infancy that to set down the possessors as "degenerates" would brand probably half the boys and girls born into the world as degenerates. Temper can be mended by proper care and correction. In a court, however, where it was treason by the law of the land to administer corporal chastisement to the heir to the crown and a substitute had to be provided whenever a whipping was ordered by the guardian, the vicious habit had little chance of mending, but was rather likely to grow worse and develop cruelty as well by the spectacle of another wincing or shrieking under the punishment the real culprit should have got. It was customary in those days to arrange royal marriages at a premature time of life, and so it is found that at the age of thirteen Carlos was provided with a bride of the future in the person of young Elizabeth of Valois, daughter of King Henry II. of France and his consort, Catherine de Medicis. There was nothing formal in this arrangement, as was shown by the marriage of the boy's father to the very same princess in a little while after the time of the rumored engagement, his third wife, Queen Mary of England, having died. But on these facts the Italian and French romance writers built up a wild tale of boyish love and guilty intrigue, like the story of Hugo and Parisina, and the mysterious death of the prince, a few years afterwards, is attributed to an act of parental vengeance for an unnatural *liaison*. Other writers declare that Carlos took the side of the Dutch when the revolt of the Netherlands set Europe once again in a flame, and for this treason

was done to death. Raumer's investigations disclosed the truth. These versions were purely imaginary, as far as the suggestion of a guilty intrigue with the Queen stepmother was concerned—absolutely ridiculous in their improbability. As regards the sympathy of Carlos for the Flemish insurgents, there may have been a sentiment, but nothing more. The real reason why King Philip found it necessary to put the youth under restraint—friendly restraint, not formal confinement—was his mental condition. He had intermittent fits of insanity, at times becoming dangerous to his watchers. And the cause of this periodical insanity was simple enough. It was not "degeneracy" or hereditary criminality, as the latest theory implies, but the natural result of a very serious accident. Raumer describes it graphically, as he found it told in the State papers. The boy was at the time past his seventeenth year. He was at the University of Alcala, pursuing his studies, along with his kinsmen, Don John or Juan of Austria and the Duke of Parma. He had fallen in love with the pretty daughter of the gardener of a neighboring estate. Stealing out to pay her a visit by an unfrequented way, he fell down a flight of steps somehow and received injuries on the head so serious that his life was for long despaired of. The French Ambassador, St. Sulpice, wrote home that he had to undergo the operation of trepanning. Would not such a circumstance fully account for the after eccentricities of the youth, without the necessity of conjuring up any theory of moral decadence?

Previous to this accident, however, Don Carlos had been in a very poor state of health—so much so that the French Ambassador, Guibert, had, in the previous year, written to Queen Catherine that his condition was hopeless. At that time Catherine designed to form an alliance between her remaining daughter, Margaret, she who subsequently married King Henry of Navarre, and the heir apparent to the throne of Spain. The French and Italian commentators, those hangers-on of the court who acted the part of secret agents for their respective governments, had each personal and national motives for misrepresenting, in different ways, the actions and motives of both King Philip and the Crown Prince. They attributed the latter's misfortunes to his vices. The English mischief-makers did the same thing at the time that Philip's marriage with Queen Mary was the subject of angry controversy. And yet no historian has ever been able to substantiate these tales. Philip was, take him for all and all, a more moral monarch than most other monarchs of his own time or perhaps our own. But he was an uncompromising and combative upholder of the old religion. That fact made him in such eyes appear as a monster.

The measures which the King was obliged to take in order to

restrain the forward inclinations of the unhappy youth seem to have produced in him a sullen and dangerous spirit. There is evidence that he cherished animosity against both his father and his half brother, Don Juan. He may have entered into correspondence with some of the leaders of the revolt in the Low Countries, but of this there is no proof beyond the general assertions of anti-Catholic historians. However, written evidence in such a case should not be looked for, since if any ever existed it must have been destroyed when its message had been delivered to those for whose direction or information it had been sent. The measures which his father was compelled to take, as well as the prevalent gossip at the court, give reason to believe that there was substantial ground for the father's fear that the prince's malady, or passion, whichever it was, had taken the form of secret treason. One of the symptoms of his distemper seems to have been an unbounded credulity. A couple of years after he had sustained the injury to his head a French agent named Hopper is found thus writing to Cardinal Granvelle about his (the prince's) condition: "There is nothing to be made of Don Carlos. He believes all that is said to him; and were he even told that he was dead he would believe it."

In illicit passion the dramatists have found the solution of this waywardness of mind. This is the usual dramatic way. They represent the unfortunate youth as having fallen in love—at the age of thirteen!—with the princess who afterward became his stepmother, and that this passion was reciprocated and continued after their relations had become thus altered. This would account for the King's stern behavior. A jealous suspicion of both wife and son would naturally lead even the most amiable of men to take measures that must appear harsh; and the desire to avert an open scandal would furnish reasonable ground for putting the most culpable of the parties under secure restraint.

Raumer's investigations on this point were searching, and what he found appears to shatter effectually the theory on which the dramatists had built up their poetic structure. One of the incidents of their tragedy was the secret effort of Philip to get rid of an unfaithful spouse by poison, and at the same time be avenged on his unnatural son by having him murdered in prison. Indeed such was the open statement made by the Prince of Orange in his Apology for the Netherlands rising against the yoke of Spain. Little wonder that the dramatists should have seized on the story as a theme worthy of the age of Æschylus. Raumer could find no trace of justification for the charge. On the contrary, he finds that Carlos' conduct toward his royal stepmother, in the periods of his sanity was most circumspect, and at the same time filial. Raumer

gives proofs of his conclusions. He cites a large number. One or two will suffice to indicate their importance:

"In February, 1562, Cardinal Guibert wrote to Queen Catherine: 'King Philip continues to love his consort more and more. If others say to the contrary, that is all bugbears and lies; rather the consideration and influence of your daughter have tripled in the last three months, and her husband appears serene and contented.'

"In June, 1564, St. Sulpice writes: 'The Queen of Spain is good and handsome, and not less joyous and satisfied at her lord's return than she was troubled at his journey and long absence.'

"In 1565 the Queen made a journey to Bayonne, and the King and Don Carlos went to the frontier to meet her on her return. Cardinal Guibert wrote of the event: 'The King and Queen received each other as affectionately as can be imagined, and each tried which could show the other the most honor. . . . Prince Carlos rode three leagues to meet them (at Segovia); he approached the Queen on foot and labored to take her hand and kiss it; nor did she neglect to return his salutation. I can assure you, madame, that the Queen, your daughter, lives in the greatest contentment in the world, through the perfect kindness which the King, her husband, more and more shows her. . . . Moreover, the King has received such favorable reports of her virtuous conduct during the whole journey, and is so satisfied therewith, that he always loves, esteems and honors her.' "

About this period there had been some talk about the prince's future. His stepmother wished that he might be preserved for her sister, the Princess Margaret, and therefore was not partial to the proposal made by the Queen of Bohemia that her daughter, the Archduchess Anne, might be his bride—for royal ladies seemed to have a perpetual leap year's privilege in those days. St. Sulpice, in a letter of September, 1565, writes in a way that would indicate a partiality for the Archduchess (whose miniature, probably, had been sent him, as was the vogue in all such transactions, not always with the happiest results, as we know from the story of Henry VIII. and Anne of Cleves). He said:

"The King and Queen repaired to a country house, whither the prince came after his recovery. As he was one day driving out with the Queen and her ladies in the park, in a carriage drawn by oxen, he remained a long time silent, when the Queen asked him where he was with his thoughts. He answered, 'More than two hundred miles hence.' 'And where is that, so far off?' asked the Queen further. The prince rejoined: 'I am thinking of my cousin.' " Raumer believes this referred to the Archduchess, whose marriage with him was then under negotiation.

Those extracts proved to Raumer that the King and Queen lived happily and that Carlos and his stepmother lived on terms of affectionate friendship, and nothing else. The King's later suspicions lay evidently in quite a different direction. He had learned that his son was in a dangerous state of mind, intermittently, and that he aspired to be made Viceroy of the Netherlands. By January, 1568, matters had taken a serious turn, as shown by extracts from the letters of a new French Ambassador, Fourquevaulx:

"The 14th instant the King sent orders to all the churches and cloisters in this town, commanding that at all Masses and all canonical hours prayers should be offered up imploring God to grant him counsel and inspiration relative to a plan which he broods in his heart. This has given all the curious of the court something to talk about, and I am not quite certain whether this refers to the prince. True it is, however, that long before his journey to the Escurial the King had not spoken to him, great discontent prevailed between them and the prince could not conceal the rancor he nourished in his heart against his father. Far from it, he indiscreetly said: 'Amongst five persons to whom I bear most ill will, the King is, after Ruy Gomez, the first.' To the charge of the last he lays whatever thwarts his wishes.

"It is well known that at Christmas time he did not receive the Communion or obtain any share in the jubilee because he would not renounce his hatred and forgive, whereupon his confessor would not give him absolution. Hereupon he applied to other theologians, but received the same answer. There are even people who say he intended to do his father an ill turn. But, however that be, the King last night went into the prince's room, found a loaded pistol in the bed and committed him to the charge of Ruy Gomez, the Duke of Feria, the Prior Antonio and Don Lope Quichada, with express orders that he should speak to no living soul save in their sight and hearing."

Previous to this open rupture it would seem that the unfortunate dreamer had been under a kind of informal surveillance, in the keeping of Don Juan of Austria. He believed that the latter was betraying his secrets, whatever they were, and grew morose and jealous of him. He insulted him, in the King's presence, and Don Juan gave up his charge and left the quarters assigned them.

King Philip was at pains to explain to the French Ambassador, as he wrote on the 5th of February, why he had had to adopt measures of restriction toward his son. He told him that he had become deranged, and that, after long hoping that he would recover his intellect, he was forced to conclude that the hope was vain.

He felt he could not intrust his subjects to Don Carlos, and was obliged to place him under restraint. The Ambassador learned from the talk about court that Don Carlos had acutally attempted to shoot Don Juan, after having, with the cunning of the insane, lured him into a spot where the deed might be done unnoticed, but that Juan was able to wrest the weapon from him as he was about to use it. He had also got a companion named Leava to lie in wait for Juan, with a similar intent, in case he himself failed.

These facts were not relied on by the King in his explanation to the Ambassador, but were commonly discussed in the court precincts.

The next steps taken by the King were to gain possession of the prince's papers and make preparations for depriving him, by process of law, of the right of succession, as one unfit to govern.

The Queen was greatly grieved over these painful doings. She wept for two days, the Ambassador told her mother; but Raumer sees in this no evidence of a guilty attachment, as the dramatists sought to show existed.

The tragic story ended in a short time afterward. The Emperor intervened more than once on Carlos' behalf, for he had in his early days shown considerable liking for his grandson. But Philip was determined to brook no interference with his purposes. He politely refused all offers to take the prince off his hands; and in this he was acting for the peace of his kingdom, since wherever the Heir Apparent would be he must be a source of danger to the throne and the country, in view of his opposition to his father. The mode and manner of his death are not clearly shown, since the official letter on this point is missing from the Ambassador's correspondence, but that there was nothing to hide, on the King's part, is clearly proved by subsequent letters relating to the communication of the sad event to foreign States and the account of the prince's funeral and the mourning for his demise. These were precisely the same as though he had been King, in accordance with the traditional custom of the Spanish monarchy.

After examining all the available documents and weighing their import, as against the mass of rumor and fiction, Raumer sums up the case in judicial fashion, thus:

1. Carlos was from the first infirm in body and ill-disposed in mind. This last evil was, by the violence of his passions, aggravated even to madness, although periods of reason and repentance intervened.

2. In moments of violent passion the hatred which he undeniably cherished against his father may have brought forth thoughts and expressions tending toward his death.

3. Carlos was at all events incapable of governing, and sufficient grounds existed for keeping him under strict watchfulness.

4. He and the Queen died natural deaths, and never did the slightest affair of the heart occur between them.

It was an irresponsible romancer, Antonio Perez, who started the story of the prince's fate which gave the clue to the dramatists. The young man was clearly demented for a considerable time, and his dementia is clearly traceable to the accident to his head. He died in confinement, but by what form of disease there is no present means of pronouncing. He was no degenerate, in the sense of the term understood by Lombroso, but a degenerate by natural process, as most demented persons are.

Schiller's conception of Don Carlos seems to have been based upon the theory propounded by the fiction-mongers—namely, that he was persecuted by his father because he was an enlightened prince, the friend of liberty and progress and therefore opposed to his father's policy in the Netherlands. The assumption is entirely gratuitous. Thorough investigation of the whole sad history, by a competent and impartial witness, failed to bring any evidence whatever to show that any such grounds of difference existed. It is a story of unhappy domestic discord and the lamentable consequences of a pampered childhood and unbridled indulgence in the passions of youth. There is hardly a royal family in Europe of which a similar story could not be told at one time or other.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

Philadelphia.

DO THE FILIPINOS REALLY HATE THE SPANISH FRIARS?

I

THERE are certain historical statements laid down by English and American writers as axioms, or self-evident propositions, not worth the trouble of proving or arguing about, so sure are the writers of the blind sympathy of their readers, shackled as they all are by a common tradition. They are therefore laid down as taken for granted and set forth with rhetorical and sentimental phrases which take the place of honest historical enquiry and truthfulness and serve to carry on the baseless tradition to a new generation. Of such a nature are the diatribes about Spanish tyranny and oppression of subject races, in plain contra-

diction to the known facts of history, Spain, the pioneer of religion and civilization in the New World and the Far East, having done more for subject races than any other European nation. Is it not a wonder that no one is bold enough to break with the false tradition and honestly tell the truth? But fiction is more palatable than truth in many instances to the generality of readers, and it is hard even for an independent mind to reject the venerable Protestant traditions about Spain and the Inquisition, brought three centuries ago to the shores of America by the English settlers and religiously believed in ever since.

It is to be feared that before long the alleged general hatred of the Filipinos for the Spanish friars will be embodied in the same category and placed beyond the reach of argument, so unanimous are the English and American writers, since the Americans landed in the Philippines, in propagating the idea. John Foreman, one of the meanest, most prejudiced and untruthful writers of our time, loudly proclaimed as the "standard authority on the Philippines," has set the pace, and, with the exception of Sawyer, an independent witness, the others have blindly followed in his footsteps. Even those who pose as especially independent inquirers, such as the journalist who was sent out this year to write up the islands for a newspaper syndicate, have paid attention merely to the one-sided evidence forced on every American in the Philippines, culpably neglecting to take into account the evidence that points to the opposite conclusion. I am aware that the quasi-judicial authority of the late Governor Taft may be quoted against me. In his report, written after taking evidence at the Commission on the Friars, he expresses himself to the effect that there existed a very general hostility to the friars, and that whether it was an unreasoning sentiment of an easily excitable people or was based on real grievances, it should be taken into account. Speaking afterwards in America he also said that the Filipinos owed all their civilization to the friars, but that the latter had made themselves odious to the people by acting as spies to the Spanish Government for the last half century. This testimony, coming from a man in his position, must have made a great impression in America, but it is not generally known that his means of observation were limited. With the exception of the evidence of the Bishops and provincials, to be quoted shortly, given at the Commission, he had no means of hearing the other side. During his sojourn in the Philippines Governor Taft had no means of learning the sentiments of the masses at first hand, and he was surrounded the whole time by the anti-friar clique, whose great object was to prejudice his mind against the friars and represent the people as wholly hostile to them. Both the Schurman and the

Taft Commissions, the printed reports of which got such a large circulation to form public opinion, was packed with anti-clericals, and no evidence was taken from any native in favor of the friars, one prominent Filipino, whose sentiments were well known, not having been asked any question on that subject during his examination. It would be impossible to find in any other printed book, especially of an official character, so many absurd, filthy and slanderous lies as were gathered together by the Taft Commission and published to the world by the Government at Washington. Yet this extraordinary compilation as much as any other agency has prejudiced public opinion on a question so very momentous to the Catholic Church and the religious orders. The sole redeeming feature of the publication is the evidence of the Bishops and the heads of the religious orders, clear, concise, conclusive and diametrically the opposite to that given by the other side. Want of fairness, however, is apparent even here from the fact that the defense of the friars was made first and could only be given in general terms, as they did not know what would be said against them by the witnesses for the prosecution, no chance being afterwards allowed of replying to specific odious charges made against them either individually or in general. The evidence should either not have been published at all, or, if published, the friars should have been allowed to answer to specific charges and have their answers embodied in the same publication.

The friars, who have lived for years in the country, who know the native languages, have had most intimate dealings as priests with the people and more opportunities for studying their character than any other class; who saw the approach of the revolution and went through the horrors of a long captivity, have never admitted a general hostility of the people towards them. Let us here bring together the evidence on this point, given by the Bishops, all friars, and the heads of the religious orders before the Taft Commission. The Archbishop of Manila's evidence was as follows:

"Q. And (the friars) being loyal to Spain and representing the Government of Spain in so many capacities, was it not natural that those who began the insurrection against Spain should have a hostility towards those representatives?

"A. It is very natural. All the more so since this feeling of enmity was not so much that of the great mass of the people as those who constituted this revolting element against the sovereignty of Spain."

The Bishop of Jaro in answer to questions said: "Antagonism or hostility on the part of the mass of the people does not exist. There is hostility against them (the friars) on the part of these

few half-educated men who have been conspirators against the Spanish Government, many of whom had to be deported from the islands. The real reason is, say what you may, the supporters of the Spanish sovereignty here were the priests, and that is the reason that it is only these men and not the masses of the people that are against them."

The provincial of the Dominican Order said: "As a matter of fact, among the mass of the people this hatred does not exist. It does exist among the Katipunans, and here and there among the better classes, but the whole reason of the hatred of this class against the priests lies in the fact that they were the bulwarks of Spanish sovereignty in the islands, and these people, recognizing their loyalty to their government, saw that in order to break down the sovereignty of Spain it was necessary to cast odium upon the religious orders and have them, if possible, expelled from the country."

The provincial of the Franciscans, on being asked if those in favor of the revolution were hostile to his order because they represented the Spanish Government, said: "That is not the case so far as the Franciscans are concerned, for when the insurrection broke out the natives got them out of the way, so that there would be no trouble in store for them. Even the money they had in their houses was sent to them to Manila by the insurgents."

The provincial of the Augustinians, in answer to the question whether he thought the friars of his order could return to their former parishes, said: "As soon as the Government of the United States has established its laws and there is personal security, I can state that the people are anxious to receive the priests back in their old parishes."

"Q. Are you in communication with the people back in the old parishes.

"A. Yes, sir; we receive many letters from them. A great many from the various provinces I have mentioned come here and visit us, tell us about what is going on, and say we can go back at any time; but at the present time there is no personal security, everything being controlled by the Katipunans."

The provincial of the Recoletos testified to the same effect:

"Q. Any hostility to the Crown of Spain among the people was against the priest as representing the Government of Spain?

"A. Absolutely. There was no resentment, or hostility, or ill-feeling whatever against the priests up to the time of the revolution, and that feeling has germinated right here in Manila and has spread from sources to be found here in Manila. There was really no feeling in the provinces against the priests, and, as I have said

before, this feeling was spread by the heads of the revolution, by those who had political aspirations and something to gain by a revolution. A great many of them came from Manila. They formed or were a part of the Spanish Government, that is, clerks, some of them in the courts, and as they knew a little more than the simple country people, they spread rumors against the priests when they went to the small towns, and as the latter made efforts to protect the people hostile feeling was awakened."

This is strong and unanimous testimony coming from learned ecclesiastics occupying high positions, and, as superiors, holding intimate relations with the friars and native secular clergy all over the archipelago. It ought indeed to bring conviction to an unbiased mind. During the four years that have passed since that evidence was given the friars have not seen fit to revise their position. What a pity that authors and journalists do not listen to their side of the case before committing themselves so confidently to print.

American opinion in the islands is mostly worthless, formed as it is at haphazard and by the slippery and mendacious Filipinos these residents come in contact with, many of whom would express the very opposite sentiments to the friars themselves. The ordinary half-educated Filipino generally says what he thinks will please, and it takes a long time to know him and find out his real sentiments. I have had some curious experiences of this side of the Filipino character. I have been speaking to men who were apparently very much against the friars as long as they did not know I was one, but when I declared myself it was amusing to notice how their faces brightened up with joy and how, without any sense of shame, they declared themselves great friends of the friars and spoke of this and the other father with marks of affection.

My experience in Manaoag, in the province of Pangasinan, where I lived in the convent with four other Dominican friars for three months, all tended to confirm the impression that the poorer classes of the population at any rate still looked with reverence and affection on the Spanish friar. It is true that there as elsewhere there were three or four friar-haters, one of whom had gained notoriety during the revolution for his cruelties; but with these exceptions the relations between the fathers and the people were of the best. This was patent to any observer from the way the services in the church were attended, the confessionals frequented and the convent approached daily by numbers both from the village and from other parts to consult the fathers about their affairs. What was remarkable to me was the general custom of men, women and children going out of their way to salute us by kissing our

hands, the men with uncovered heads. This practice was not confined to the people of the village. As the road that passed the convent led direct to Benguet, where the Americans are employing thousands of laborers in laying a new road through the mountains, not an evening passed without our meeting with long lines of carts driven by men from distant pueblos, the customary salute from those being more general than among our own villagers, some of whom were afraid to make a display of their feelings for fear of the local anti-friars. Every year at the great festival held about Easter time thirty or forty thousand people came from all parts of Pangasinan and neighboring provinces to pay their devotions, and the fathers were kept busy in the confessionals from morning till night for several days, the concourse being actually greater than it was before the revolution, when everything was tranquil.

It might be inferred from this that the fathers had found no difficulty in returning to Manaoag after the revolution and the war. But such is the determination of the anti-friar party and the timidity of the people that it was only by strategem they were able to reëstablish themselves there after an absence of four years. When they came the native priest who had invited them back and gave them shelter in his house, the convent being occupied at the time by American troops, received anonymous letters threatening him with death if he did not send them away, and it is not at all improbable that the threat would have been carried into effect only for the presence of the Americans. When the fathers afterwards took possession of the convent such was the terrorism exercised that they found it impossible for some time to get servants, and it was only gradually that their friends took courage to approach them.

An incident which occurred during my stay in the place shows to what absurd deception the anti-friar party will descend to bolster up the deception that the friars are hated by the people, even given the plainest evidence to the contrary. A few days before Rosary Sunday last year the native parish priest went to Manila to be present at the reception of Dr. Dougherty, one of the American Bishops, remaining as a guest in the Dominican convent during his stay in the city. On the following Sunday the great procession of the Rosary took place in the evening, about four thousand people marching in it under the direction of the four Dominican friars. It took about two hours to go round the village, was very grand and impressive, and as far as I could judge very orderly. I heard afterwards, however, that a slight disturbance had taken place, owing to a man breaking through the files and walking between them with his hat on. It was over in two minutes. This was the occasion of one of the anti-friar party, probably the very author of the dis-

turbance, writing a puerile travesty of the incident to the Filipino papers in Manila, to the effect that the native priest had been driven from the village by the friars and had gone to complain about them to Manila; that the people when they saw that the procession was headed by the friars were furious; that the women threw off their veils and attacked the friars with the candles they held in their hands, and that the friars, who were bruised considerably by the treatment they received, went to the president of the village to complain, but got his answer that he could do nothing for them. These childish absurdities, which are a fair specimen of the unscrupulous methods used to deceive the people, were cautiously inserted in that part of the paper printed in the native Tagalo language, for fear that if inserted in Spanish there might be a contradiction and prosecution for libel. This year, unfortunately, the Katipunans succeeded in almost destroying the great Easter religious gathering. Violence and robbery took place along the roads leading to the village just as the pilgrimage began, false reports were spread about, and, sad to say, hardly more than four or five thousand people were brave enough to come to fulfil their religious duties out of the vast multitude that had come on the two previous years. It is plain that tyranny and intimidation of the worst description exists in the archipelago, practised by a political party which to satisfy virulent hatred and gain ignoble ends thinks nothing of depriving their fellow-countrymen of the consolations of the Catholic religion.

Under the plea that a general hostility towards the friars existed among the Filipinos, the Insular Government entered into an agreement with the Delegate Apostolic that the friars should not be sent back to their former parishes, unless the people of the parish petitioned for them. Petitions of this nature had already been coming in to the American authorities, and previous to that to Aguinaldo from the beginning of the revolution, when he held more than four hundred friars in captivity. On the agreement becoming generally known, petitions came pouring in from all sides in spite of the vigilance of the anti-friar party and the cowardice of the people. Strange to say, for some occult reason that has never been explained, the petitions were laid aside, notably in the case of the Macabebe people, enthusiastic supporters of the friars, who sent in petitions several times over. In other instances the petition was sent back to the leading anti-friars, who by their well-known methods of intimidation got up a counter petition to render the first nugatory. Sometimes the petition never reached its destination, as the provincial governor might insist on its going through his hands, which meant its going into the fire immediately after.

Even when a petition takes effect and a friar is sent to a parish every effort is made by the anti-friars to drive him out by violence. Just as insurgent plans and raids are directed from Manila, the anti-friar campaign gets its guidance and inspiration from the same centre. A short time ago some friars were ministering peaceably in a certain parish and everything was going on quietly when word was received from Manila by the president to know why he allowed the friars to remain there. He answered that the people were very fond of them; that they were good men, and that things were going on harmoniously. "We don't want to know that," was the answer he received; "all we want to know is what steps have you taken to put them out?"

A few examples will be of service in throwing light on this peculiar situation. The people of the town of Dumaguete, the capital of Eastern Negros, petitioned for a friar. Their sentiments towards the friars were well known to the revolutionists, for when the friars had to fly just as the Tagalo revolutionary bands were expected from Manila, the people in great grief crowded round the vessel imploring the friars not to abandon them. When the Tagalos appeared they abandoned their homes and fled up the mountains. Their petition was acceded to and a Recoleto friar was sent to them. But the president of the town, evidently acting under instructions, calling out the police, unwilling instruments in his hands, advanced to the friar armed with a revolver, just as he was approaching the convent and drove him out of the town by force. He then sent word along the coast to the other presidents to act in a similar way if a friar attempted to enter the towns. When notice of the affair was sent to Manila and the matter came to light the president was promptly suspended by the American Governor. Nevertheless the harm was done and the people have not been able to get a friar ever since. Under a new president several petitions have been sent for friars to Manila, but the provincial governor, a brother of the late suspended president and an open sympathizer with a Protestant proselytizing institution in the town, is powerful enough to hinder them from taking effect.

The following instance will show pretty clearly how one of the principal difficulties encountered is the cowardice of the people, who, in spite of their good-will, allow themselves to be cowed by armed ruffians. Another Recoleto friar, Father Callisto Gaspar, about two years ago received a letter from the native priest of Camigen, province of Misamis, Mindanao, asking him to come back to his old parish of Mambajan, where he had ministered for sixteen years, and adding that the leading men of the various pueblos round about were all anxious for his return. The work was press-

ing too hard on the native priest and his assistant, as thirty thousand souls had to be looked after, who had been attended to before the revolution by four Recoleto friars. This was by no means the first intimation he got of the wishes of the people, for his return to the parish had been solicited the very year he had been forced to fly. Father Gaspar now put the matter before the ecclesiastical authorities, and they readily consented to his return. Accordingly he sailed for Mindanao, to the town where the native priests were and made his way to the convent, getting hearty salutations from all sides from the people. The president of the town paid him a friendly visit and asked him to stay in his house, where he would be safe from the violence of any malcontents who might attempt to molest him, but the friar decided to remain in the convent. He had a busy day in the church, as the people were flocking the whole day to the confessional. In the meantime, however, a Tagalo, who had settled in Mindanao several years before and had apparently been a great friend of the friars before the revolution, organized a small band of roughs and in the evening as Father Gaspar was in the upper corridor of the convent showers of stones were hurled against the windows. A notice, too, was fixed on the doors of the convent ordering him to quit. At the first intimation of violence the native priest gave way to fright and locked himself in his room, and it was with the greatest difficulty that the friar succeeded in getting him to sign a requisition to the president for protection. His hand shook so much that he could hardly hold the pen. The president on getting this notice sent a guard of police to the convent and kept them there during the three following nights. In the morning after the disturbance crowds assembled at the convent condoling with the friar and protesting that it was all the work of a few ruffians. It was a pity that they could not bring themselves to make a more energetic protest at night instead of shutting themselves up in their houses. During the following three days the people took advantage of the friar's presence and flocked to the church, keeping him busy in the confessional all the time. On the fourth day he and the native priest started on horseback for the town of Mambajan, where Father Gaspar had ministered as parish priest for sixteen years. On arriving at a village on the way the native priest got down and entered a house, leaving the friar by himself on the road in conversation with a friend. While thus engaged a man came up and threw a large stone at him, hitting him in the face. He was informed at the same time that a man was posted behind the house armed with a revolver and ready to shoot him if he proceeded on his journey, and that there were others lurking there armed with daggers. The end was that the

native priest, overcome with fright, insisted that his only course, owing to the hostility of these desperadoes, was to go back by the same steamer which brought him and which was still lying in the harbor. Judging it necessary himself, as he had been basely deserted by the priest and people who should have supported him, he left, and the consequence is that for more than a year thirty thousand people have been without the services of a resident priest, the two native priests having gone elsewhere. The occasional visit of a Jesuit father from another mission is all the priestly ministration the people can get.

Shortly afterwards Father Gaspar received a petition from the people of a town in the Island of Bohol asking him to go there as parish priest. He forwarded the petition in due course to Manila, but that was the last heard of it. Many other petitions have been sent from Bohol, but they likewise appear to have been all shelved. Moreover, deputations have come from the island to the Recoleto friars in Cebu praying them to return, but in spite of their willingness to go the necessary formal authorization could not be obtained. Before the revolution forty Recoleto friars ministered in the island to a population of 300,000 souls. There was only one Spaniard there besides themselves, the lieutenant of the Guardia Civil, who with twelve native guards kept the whole island in order. It was a crimeless island, murder and robbery being unknown, and, needless to say, the relations between the fathers and this simple people were of the best. At present, owing to the enforced absence of the friars, the spiritual wants of this vast population are left to the attendance of fifteen native priests.

A little more courage and determination on the part of the people is all that is required. In a town in the Island of Cebu an Augustinian friar well liked by the people had been ministering some time, when a new president, appointed by the Governor of Cebu, appeared on the scene and wishing to show his authority, ordered him out. Finding that the friar took no heed and that he would have to resort to violence, the president brought in some ignorant half-savage men from the mountains and got them to begin a noisy demonstration in front of the convent preparatory to an attack. The American school teacher in the town, who knew the circumstances, was roused out of his sleep by some of the townspeople, who came to inform him of the outrage and beg him to accompany them and defend the friar. Seizing a revolver and the American flag, he went to the president's house, told him he was going to place the flag over the convent and that if it was attacked he would hold him responsible for an insult to the flag and would come back and shoot him dead. The president very prudently left

his house and ordered the disturbers away, and from that night the friar did not suffer any further molestation.

During the time that Mgr. Chapelle was Delegate Apostolic in the Philippines the people of Calamba, the town belonging to the great estate of the Dominicans, petitioned for the Dominican father who had been parish priest there before the revolution. He was thereupon sent by the Delegate and received with delight by the people. Presents of food poured into the convent, and the friar could go about where he liked, though the country at the time was in a very disturbed state. A few of the anti-friar party went to the commander of the American garrison and represented to him that the friar was in league with the insurgents. This impressed the officer and he sent for the friar and asked him how it was he was able to go about alone and unarmed while his own soldiers hardly dared to venture any distance from the barracks for fear of an attack. "How is it," he added, "that you are able to get all the food you want for nothing, and we find it hard to get anything at all even for good payment?" No explanation would satisfy the officer that he had come to no understanding with the insurgents, and he ordered him back to Manila at once. The idea now impressed on American teachers and others in Calamba is, as I know well, that no friar dare venture back for fear of the vengeance of the people.

I visited an island in the south containing a population of 10,000 souls which before the revolution had had a community of five or six Recoleto friars in their midst, who attended to their spiritual wants, and like everywhere else had given them in the course of years whatever civilization they possessed. At present they have no resident priest at all, though they get a visit from one from time to time. However, every Sunday the church bell rings and the people assemble as usual to say the Rosary and sing hymns. I saw and heard enough to convince me that the people would welcome back at any time the Recoleto friars and that the latter are kept out by three or four Tagalos who settled there during the revolution, having come as part of the insurgent garrison. Immediately after the revolution the Recoleto friars returned at the desire of the people, but these Tagalos went to the American Governor and got him to send them away. The present Governor, a native, is in reality well inclined towards the friars and visited them in Manila up to some time ago, but in order to stand in well with the Federal party and make sure of the governorship he broke off relations with them and consented to make a show of opposition against them. It is hard to measure the strength of this party, combining as it does the force of open party politics with the

methods of a secret society. A test of its influence is the fact that at the last elections a candidate for provincial governor who was duly and legally elected could not get his election confirmed by the American authorities, the only apparent reason being his friendliness towards the friars, while candidates in other provinces of well-known revolutionary principles got their elections confirmed without difficulty.

Great numbers of Filipinos of the better class desire that their children should receive a religious education at the hands of the friars, and the latter found no difficulty in filling their colleges in Manila immediately after the war. As the Dominican fathers had colleges also in Tuguegarao, of the province of Cagayan, and Dagupan, of the province of Pangasinan, both of which provinces had been under their spiritual guidance, they availed themselves of the first opportunity that offered to return to these colleges and set them in working order again. They found, however, that they had to deal with the same factious opposition from the anti-friar party that the friars of all the orders had met with on their return to their parishes. In Tuguegarao the opposition was led by the governor, a Tagalo, and his party, composed principally of Tagalos likewise. In spite of the opposition the friars persevered and opened their school, which was soon filled with pupils. The unexpected result was that the following year, at the commencement exercises and banquet, some of the leaders of the opposition party were present as friends and the most laudatory speech of all was that made by the governor himself. The opposition in Dagupan, a great Aglipayan centre, was more of a rowdy character, noisy demonstrations being made in front of the college and violent and abusive letters written to the Filipino press about the "cynical friars who had come to disturb the peace of the town." The governor of the province, an Aglipayan, being prevailed on to write to the late Governor Taft, received in answer a clear statement of the rights of the friars as ordinary citizens; that as such they were at liberty like any one else to go about and settle down wherever they liked, and that if the parishioners were not pleased with their spiritual ministrations they were not bound to accept them and could go to some other place of worship. This memorable letter, defining the rights of the friars, created a great impression all over the archipelago, and if it had been written two years previously it would have hindered a great deal of injustice. At present the college in Dagupan has a fair number of pupils and the services of the fathers as confessors are in constant requisition in the parish church.

In addition to the political reasons, already indicated, for the

opposition shown by a few to the return of the friars to the parishes, due weight should be given to local and personal reasons as well. During the revolution all the convents were stripped of their furniture, libraries and other valuables, which generally found their way into the houses of some of the leading men of the towns. I have seen the books of the convent of Manaoag piled up in a house not far off used as a post office, to which we often had to go with our letters. As these thieves and holders of stolen property have no intention of restitution and know that if the friars return they will soon be made aware of where their property is, they are naturally to be found in the opposition party. Again, a great many murders, robbery of the poor and weak and other acts of tyranny and inhumanity committed during the revolution have never come to light. Many are in peaceable possession of property robbed during that troubled time. Everywhere there is systematic oppression, the poorer classes laboring like slaves without hope of reward to pay off pretended debts; and it will be many years before the Americans, if ever at all, will be able to get at the root of the evil.

Ambrose Coleman, O. P.

Limerick, Ireland.

"UPON THIS ROCK."

UBI PETRUS, IBI ECCLESIA.

I.

PERSONAL insignificance, even when so entire as in the case of the present writer, may sometimes be useful in helping towards the solution of a great question. The reasons (so far as they can be expressed in the brief space at my command) which led even one obscure, unknown English parson to come back to the faith of his fathers may possibly be of some little service on this very account—that there can be no glamor of intellectual eminence, influence or learning about the writer, and therefore what force his reasons may possess will be the result simply of their own cogency.

Though my own position was such as I have described it, I have had (and trust I still have) the privilege of being brought into contact, and not seldom into intimate and affectionate relationship, with much that is best and highest in Anglican thought and life. For this I can feel nothing but gratitude; while at the same time it is impossible not to realize that, in my own case and in

countless others, this very fact has for years hindered the true character of Anglicanism, or the imperative claims of the Catholic Church, from being realized. There is nowadays in the Church of England so much that is like the old religion and so much honest conviction that it is in fact that religion and nothing else—it is so possible to hold and to teach, without effectual interference, almost the whole of Catholic truth—that the dividing line between the Church and all outside her borders, so unmistakably clear two generations ago, is *from the Anglican side* (never of course from that of the Church) strangely obscured. Besides this, the sections into which the Church of England is split up, though there is far more mutual courtesy and social friendliness than there was thirty or forty years back, are probably more deeply divided than ever in their real principles and aims. There is much in the belief of the so-called "extreme" members of the High Church section that they never dream of discussing beyond their immediate ecclesiastical circle; they have ideals, hopes, aims of their own which they know would inexpressibly shock and scandalize their Protestant-minded brethren; amongst themselves they accept and practise everything the Church believes and practises, so far as they know how, with the single exception of submission to the claims of the Holy See. The laity are quite as enthusiastic as the clergy, and often more desirous of external advance. And the natural result is that to many it seems as if all that is necessary for the life and worship of the Church is really possessed, and that in perseverance in their present position lies the way to that reunion which was the avowed end of the Tractarian revival, and is the aim and prayer of all devout and consistent "Anglo-Catholics."

All this, really excellent as it is in its absolute good faith and its earnest spirit of self-sacrifice, leads almost imperceptibly to the unconscious creation of a "fools' paradise." There is an inevitable tendency to identify one's own immediate surroundings with the general body of Anglicanism; one's own aims with the general drift of the communion to which one belongs; and to ignore the terrible truths of past history and of present scandal.

These are some of the causes that keep back many souls from submission and reconciliation; that explain the long delays and the weighing of arguments for perhaps many years, and that explain, too, the indisputable good faith of the lingerers.

II.

High-church Anglicans are divided into strata that, however they appear united, are really based on different principles. There are the successors of the old "High and Dry" party—good if not

very intelligent people, who are prepared to defend every Anglican inconsistency, and who hold a brief for every corruption and every compromise. There are, again, those who rise far above this poor level, but whose sympathies are cramped and whose rational grasp of facts and principles is hopelessly weakened by a supposed necessity of squaring all belief and practice to the later traditions and usages of "our Church"—a body which, on their own theory, can at best be nothing more than certain isolated provinces of the Universal Church. These well-meaning people have often such words as "primitive" and "catholic" on their lips, but their meaning is always bounded by what is strictly limited in time and narrowly local as to place. In fact, they glory in the idea, wholly anti-Christian (in the ordinary sense) as it is, of a "National Church," and their appeal to the first four or the first six centuries (or whatever the number may be) is always conditioned by how far the Book of Common Prayer is supposed to sanction universal law or custom, or the teaching and practice of the saints! This is the popular party at present in the Church of England; it is beloved by Bishops, has supplied candidates for not a few high places and is even reckoned with by ministers.

Beyond these and altogether different in spirit are the clergy and laity—comparatively few in number, but with scarcely an exception animated by intense conviction and reality—who practically accept the whole faith and discipline of the Church with the exception of the claims of the Holy See, on the principle that whatever the "Undivided Church" (*i. e.*, the Church up to the time of the Photian schism) has regarded as Catholic must be so regarded by all faithful Christians. There is no question in this section of the Anglican body as to such truths as the Sacrifice of the Mass, Penance, Purgatory and the present reign of the saints with Christ in heaven; and by most the Immaculate Conception of our Lady is devoutly recognized as at least a "pious opinion." Catholic practice as to fasting, communion, confession, prayers and sacrifice for the departed, invocation of our Lady and the saints are accepted as matter of course. The members of this section believe, as is indeed the historical fact, that the adherents of the old religion, waiving the one point of the supremacy of the Pope, were intended to be included in the Anglican compromise. They point to the very title page of the Prayer Book, in which the clearest distinction is made between the "Church of England" and "the [whole Catholic] Church," of which it is assumed to be a part; and if the whole is greater than its part, they argue with evident justice that the documents of the provincial church must be interpreted by the mind of the whole body, and not vice versa. Reunion with the

Apostolic See is recognized as absolutely necessary for the *bene esse* of the Church; the English provinces are considered as unhappily separated, though still possessing order and probably jurisdiction; and the duty of waiting and doing one's best, however small, to win back the Anglican communion to Catholic unity is much dwelt and insisted upon.

There are a few clergymen, it is said, who go beyond this position and accept unhesitatingly the Vatican definitions of 1870. I never met any of these as an Anglican, and I am sure that the few who are reported (if the report is true) to take this line are not acting with any consciousness of bad faith; but it would be difficult to imagine any satisfactory defense for their position which probably they have never logically faced.

III.

I have gone into the present state of matters among Anglican High Churchmen at some length, partly because it may help to explain the action (or inaction) of many men who appear to be sitting on the ecclesiastical fence, and partly because I am convinced that comparatively few Catholics realize what are the convictions that at once draw so many close (as it seems) to the door of the Church and yet hinder them from taking the last step across the threshold.

In my own case growth of conviction was always slow, and as I became persuaded of the truth of one point after another in the Catholic religion, I found in the school I have spoken of the satisfaction I sought for my faith and worship. Ever since religious questions began to take a conscious and practical hold of my life I have regarded the Roman Church with extreme reverence and even affection; but side by side with this existed a great devotion to the Church of England, which I learnt to look upon as a part of the Western Church, separated, through her children's sins, from external communion with the rest of Christendom. Possessing, as I believed she did, the Holy Mass and the sacraments through the preservation of sacred orders at the time of the schism, I clung to the hope that it was but a question of time before she would be once more restored to her lost privileges. The "branch theory" never had the least attraction for me; it seemed a contradiction in terms, and to imply that there was no parent trunk, or if there were, there could be no question as to how the trunk from which our supposed "branch" had sprung regarded our position.

IV.

I had the great privilege in my early days, partly before and

partly after my ordination as an Anglican cleric, of being brought into close contact with some of those to whom the Church of England owes all that is best and strongest in her to-day. At Cambridge the influence and guidance of the Rev. Edmund G. Wood, now vicar of St. Clement's in that town, and one of the most learned sons of his alma mater, led me to look at the Christian religion from an intellectual and a moral point of view more seriously than I had hitherto done. From him I learnt, what even then I had for years suspected, that loyalty to the Christian tradition of all ages meant something totally different from ordinary Anglican faith and practice. I shall never forget the first sermon I heard him preach, when he was yet personally unknown to me and I was a young undergraduate, on the merits of the saints. Still less can I be unmindful of his unwearied patience and ever-ready help, which has continued through many years and to which I know I should never turn in vain.

After taking my degree I spent a year at Cuddesdon Theological College, and while finding all kindness and making many friendships there, I was much disappointed at the intensely "moderate" tone of the college. The lectures were, of course, regulated in a large degree by the requirements of the Bishops' examinations, and were consequently as a whole small enough preparation for what I believed to be the Catholic priesthood. But the vice principal was Mr. Gore, afterwards canon of Westminster Abbey, Anglican Bishop of Worcester and now of Birmingham. To him I owe a deep debt of gratitude, and, if he will permit me to say so, of affection. His lectures on Church history led me first to any real appreciation of the true historical sense, and the private instruction in philosophy he was good enough to give me did more for me intellectually than he could have suspected. The books I read under his direction and the never-to-be-forgotten discussions of their contents gave me a mental foundation on which, alas! I have built all too sparingly.

On my ordination I worked for some time in the Diocese of Durham, then ruled by that kindest and most tolerant of Anglican prelates, Dr. Lightfoot. The diocese was just beginning to recover from the unintelligent, if consistent, puritanism of his predecessor, and the small handful of Catholic-minded clergy and laity were full of the hope of better things which the appointment of Dr. George Body as canon missioner did much to encourage. I fear that hope is still waiting for its realization. Then I went to Scotland on the invitation of Dr. Chinnery-Haldane, Anglican Bishop of Argyll and the Isles, a man whom to know is to respect and love, and who stands almost or quite alone among the Anglican "Home Episco-

pate" for his grasp of sacramental truth and his courage in proclaiming it. After taking charge for nearly three years of the newly-established mission of Inveraray I went to Edinburgh and worked for some years as assistant curate of All Saints' parish, of which Canon Alexander Murdoch had been for long and is still the deservedly esteemed rector.

From this time onwards I had the privilege of enjoying the friendship of several of the mission clergy of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, and my visits to the Anglican monastery at Cowley, Oxford, I always regard as among the specially happy episodes of my life. One retreat, conducted by Father Maturin, now for many years a Catholic, left an abiding influence on my mind and probably worked indirectly in leading me on towards the Church.

V.

While at All Saints' I received and accepted the offer of the rectorship of St. Michael's, in the same city, in succession to my very dear friend, Provost Ball, now of Cumbrae Cathedral. The church had notable traditions, extending already over nearly thirty years. The congregation, which was at first connected with a religious community whose chapel was open for public services, had from its beginning been accustomed not only to the ordinary ceremonial of the Mass, but to such ceremonies as those peculiar to Candlemas, Ash Wednesday and the last days of Holy Week. During my twelve years as rector everything external was maintained almost as I found it. The people were practically unanimous, loyal and affectionate, and I can never forget how they stood by me in various times of difficulty. Almost all came to confession; the fast before Communion was practised as a matter of course; not to assist at Mass on Sundays and holy days of obligation was recognized as grievous sin; our Blessed Lady received, I may say without presumption, our earnest love and true homage, and on her festivals and throughout her "own sweet month of May" her shrine blazed with lights and was fragrant with the flowers brought by pious hands; the other devotions of the months, such as the Sacred Heart, the Precious Blood and the Holy Souls, were also observed. Along with this there was the most rigid loyalty to the Book of Common Prayer, and never a day passed (unless through absence or urgent necessity) when the Communion service was not celebrated and the Anglican offices of morning and evening prayer duly recited. The evening services, except on Sundays (when evening prayer was sung with the usual ceremonial of Solemn Vespers) were very frequently non-liturgical and included the Sta-

tions of the Cross, devotions on the mysteries of our redemption and mission preaching.

VI.

Possessed, as we believed, of all these privileges and even luxuries of the Catholic religion, what wonder is it that many of us were filled with hope of a better future for the whole communion to which we belonged? In 1896 things seemed at their best. Lord Halifax (most honored of all Anglican laymen and most worthy of honor) had sounded in the councils of the English Church Union a clearer note than ever calling for a better understanding and a closer rapprochement between the English provinces (as we considered them) and the Western Church. A Pontiff whose whole soul was on fire with longing for the reunion of all who bore the name of Christian sat on the throne of St. Peter. It was known that a number of French ecclesiastics were disposed to look favorably on the question of Anglican ordinations. There was manifest on both sides a softening of prejudice and a mutual willingness to enter into each other's position, of which the *Revue Anglo-Romaine* was one notable fruit and evidence.

Then came, as the result of patient and earnest investigation, the authoritative decision of the Holy See declaring the ordinations of the Anglican Church to be wholly null and void. The more thoughtful minds amongst us had realized beforehand that whatever the decision might be, the real question of the relations between the Holy See and the English Church would still await solution. The possession of the Sacrament of Holy Order, and therefore of all the other sacraments, does not by itself make a religious society part of the Church of Christ. As has been excellently said, it is not the orders that make the Church, but the Church that makes the orders. And it was not to be expected on the Anglican side that those who for generations had disregarded the utterances of the Apostolic See, and whose peculiar ecclesiastical position was based on that very disregard, would be greatly moved by this particular utterance. I do not remember that any special dismay was caused amongst us by the pronouncement; a dozen specious reasons were put forward in order to nullify the effect of the bull. It was insinuated that the decision was to be explained by the supposed necessity of maintaining a precedent already established; at least one ecclesiastical journal attributed the terms of the bull to pressure from Westminster and the English hierarchy. It was pointed out that this, not being a pronouncement as to faith or morals, another Papal utterance might conceivably take another line. For those who did not acknowledge the central authority of the Catholic

Church the question was essentially an academic one, which admitted of plausible argument in either direction. Those who were troubled by the decision felt distress rather at the apparent increase of difficulties in the way of reunion than any increase of disquiet as to their own position. It is strange, certainly, that it never seems to strike an Anglican that not only the Apostolic See and all Western Christendom, but every religious body that, on the Anglican theory, may possibly belong to the Church, practically sides with Rome in this controversy. The "Jansenist" Bishops of Holland are as clear on the point as the Pope himself. It would be as impossible for an Anglican clergyman to celebrate the liturgy at the Cathedral of the Assumption in Moscow as to say Mass at St. Peter's or St. John Lateran.

However, strange though it may seem, that was not the trouble. The real misery that, little spoken of but ever growing, worked in myself and I cannot but believe in hundreds of my brethren, was to see the utter lack of desire for unity on the part of our spiritual rulers. The Bishop of my own diocese delivered a charge during that year which showed how completely such a desire, in any Catholic sense, was absent from his mind. Those who were working and praying for the peace of the City of God were spoken of in a tone of contemptuous dislike. On the other hand, those admittedly, on the Anglican theory, outside the Church were approached and flattered as if nearer to us than those whom we claimed as our brethren in the one body. And my diocesan was far from standing alone. Once again, as always, the Anglican claim on paper and in practice stood in striking contrast.

VII.

For eight years the thought that it might be impossible for me to remain where I was grew more pressing, though I tried with all my might to combat it so far as I could do so without violation to conscience and disregard of admitted truth. I dreaded the strengthening of what might come to be inevitable conviction, and on this account said next to nothing on the subject even to my closest friends. When conversation turned on the "Roman Question" I clutched at every possible argument against breaking with all my traditions and all my desires.

In 1898 the Bishop of the diocese, owing to representations made by irresponsible and mischievous persons, involved himself and me in a long and tedious controversy, which naturally led to no satisfactory result from any point of view. I agreed, in correspondence with His Lordship's desire, to forego the public use of the Hail

Mary, and wrote him an open letter of amazing futility, in which I declared, as any humble disciple of Sancta Clara, Cardinal Newman and Bishop Forbes could do without scruple, my adhesion to the twenty-second "Article of Religion." The Bishop's charge that year was mainly directed against the Catholic practice of invocation in general, and against myself in particular. I am quite sure he desired to act with even-handed justice, and even with kindness; it is not him, but the hopeless position of an Anglican prelate, that I blame for a stupid incident that brought nothing but annoyance to him, the parish and myself.

One point was, however, brought out in strong relief—that, whatever the theory might be, there was for Anglicans no appeal beyond the narrow limits of a single country and three and a half centuries. If no Church of England divine had sanctioned a doctrine or practice since 1549—*causa finita est*. On the theory "our Church" claimed as her own the English Bishops from St. Augustine to Cardinal Pole no less than since the great schism; and it was not easy to see, if the claim was genuine, why the authority of Archbishop Cranmer was to have more weight than that of St. Anselm, or the practice of Dr. Parker to be decisive as against that of St. Thomas the Martyr or Stephen Langton.

VIII.

It was impossible not to see, with unspeakable distress, that neither authority nor unity had any meaning to our rulers as a whole. The voice of the Church, even on the Anglican theory, was ignored as if it were a foreign tongue that had no interpreter. One's ears were wearied and one's heart made sick with the rubbish talked and written about "*our* Church." And any higher or broader line was stigmatized as disloyalty—to *what* it was difficult to say.

An example of this spirit was given me at a meeting of our local clerical society, at which, by request, I read a paper on the devotion due to our Blessed Lady and the saints. I had taken a line which seemed to me moderate almost to a fault, but to my dismay my essay was criticized as if I had uttered some serious heresy against faith or morals. It was obvious that "Ora pro nobis," *on Anglican grounds*, had the sanction of the "Undivided Church," and yet most even of those with whom one had the closest sympathy failed on this question of authority and appeared to think that "our Church" was free to take her own line on this question, and, by implication, on heaven knows what besides.

I may be allowed, perhaps, to take two points, one of belief and

one of discipline, as illustrating how the Anglican profession of loyalty to the "Undivided Church" breaks down in practice.

1. The Real Presence of Christ under the forms of bread and wine in the Holy Mass. On all sides it is admitted that this truth is one obviously taught by the "Undivided Church," as Anglicans understand the expression. Yet its absolute denial is not only tolerated but in practice encouraged. Archbishop Temple in one of his latest charges publicly stated his conviction that an Anglican might lawfully hold (and a clergyman by implication teach) any doctrine of the Blessed Eucharist, from a denial that just escaped the barest Zwinglianism, to an affirmation that included the materialistic and unphilosophical Lutheran heresy of consubstantiation. According to the Archbishop there was only one doctrine incompatible with membership in the Church of England—the teaching of the Catholic Church as defined by the Council of Trent and also by the Synod of Bethlehem.

2. Fasting Communion. There is and can be no controversy as to the practice of the "Undivided Church" as to the obligation. And yet the Church of England encourages in every way the disregard of such discipline, and the official utterances of many of her Bishops show as complete misunderstanding of the raison d'être of the Church's law as they do contempt for her authority.

From this and a score of other points equally easy to recognize it seemed to follow of necessity:

1. Either the Anglican Church is not a mere part, and a very small part, of Christendom, bound as such to submit to the decision and authority of the whole, but is herself the whole and therefore supreme and infallible; or,

2. The unreality of her position and her revolt from Catholic unity are self-evident.

IX.

I held on to the last possible moment; but for the incessant and absorbing work of a large town parish I should probably have made my submission long before. There did not appear sufficiently strong conviction as to justify me in leaving work and people solemnly, as I believed, committed to my care. But the question grew: *Where* was I? Did my surroundings encourage me to persist in the belief that I was indeed in the Church of St. Gregory and St. Augustine, St. Cuthbert and St. Wilfrid, Blessed John Cardinal Fisher, Blessed Thomas More and all the English martyrs? Would they acknowledge me and the communion to which I belonged? Other men could no doubt conscientiously answer the question, for a time at least, affirmatively. I could not in the end

escape the fact that seemed clear as daylight that every one of these would have told me that except on the *soliditas cathedrae Petri* there was no common standing ground for them and for me.

And again: By what authority did I believe and try to practise the religion that was my very life? On that of the Anglican Church? To begin with, there was no telling exactly what her religion was; she tolerated not merely schools of thought, but definitely divergent faiths. And so far as she had an audible voice, that voice did not certainly teach as I taught. On that of the whole Catholic Church? But *her* Living Voice denied that I had part or lot with her. It was no question of vestments or incense, or even of orders or liturgies. The one thing that mattered was, where was the authority that had divine right to tell a man what he must believe and do in order to accomplish God's will and save his soul?

X.

The gift of faith came at last like a lightning flash, and suddenly I saw I could not go on even for another day as I was. God's truth stood revealed; there could be no further delay. On other grounds I had resigned the parish, and I saw clearly that for the present at least there was no more definite work for me in the Anglican Church. My intention was to wait for some months and then to be received, if it came to that, abroad. But God spoke—and there was nothing left but to obey.

The religion I had taught and practised was, as a collection of doctrines, right, but my foundation had been wrong, or, rather, I had had no foundation. If God has really given a revelation to the world, there must be some authority to interpret and guarantee that revelation. Every religious society claims to be a teaching body. What are its credentials? The Anglican claim breaks down hopelessly, for the reasons I have given and a hundred others. The parallel sometimes drawn between the Church of England and the Orthodox (schismatic) Church of Russia, or other Oriental church (excluding, of course, the heretical bodies) is really wholly misleading. The Catholic faith is, not merely by theory, but in living energy, the religion of those churches, however separation from the centre of unity has dimmed their light and weakened their witness and tainted them with the local and national spirit which contradicts so completely the spirit of Christ and His Redemption. To appeal to the East is certainly not to gain any support for Anglican isolation or for Anglican methods.

But there is in the world one clear, consistent, unhesitating Witness to the Truth, one Voice that speaks with an utterance

unfaltering, unchanging, divinely strong. The very consistency of the Catholic Church is indeed one of the charges that her enemies bring against her. And in the special authority and privilege bestowed upon St. Peter and his successors there is provided for her children a court of appeal from what is merely local, or provincial, or national, a central and supreme tribunal that lasts from age to age, the living Voice of the Divine Shepherd of souls speaking through His earthly Vicar for the guidance, the warning, the consolation of His children. God's truth cannot live on paper, in Holy Scripture, the writings of the doctors of the Church or the decrees of councils only; if there is no way by which the Holy Ghost is to guide the Church into all truth to-day, the gates of hell have indeed prevailed against her.

So the divine light came in its fulness to yet another soul. I can say with thankfulness that so far had I been blessed before I made my submission that in no point, except of course with regard to the divinely bestowed authority of the Vicar of Christ, has my belief been altered since I was received into the Church. Everything has but become clearer, more harmonious, more satisfying. My one regret is for any disloyalty to grace that may have delayed the light for so many years. And my prayer is that all to whom it was my high privilege to minister may be led, as many have already been, to share the unspeakable peace and rejoice in the glorious liberty of the home life of the Catholic Church.

"Accedite ad Eum et illuminamini: et facies vestrae non confundentur."

J. Faber Scholfield.

Holy Island, England.

THE CANADIAN NORTHWEST SCHOOL QUESTION.[1]

OF CANADA'S more than five millions, some half million are now to be found in the new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, about to celebrate on next "Dominion Day," July 1, their having come into being during the current session of the Canadian Parliament. Longitude 110 divides these two provinces, formed out of the smaller territories of the same names, together with Athabasca and Assiniboia, which now disappear. North latitude 60 divides the new provinces from the further northwest territory. Each of them is about the size of Ontario. Manitoba, lying between it and them, looks small in comparison. Something of the cosmopolitan immigration known

[1] *Vide American Catholic Quarterly Review*, April, 1895, and January, 1898.

to the United States is now becoming familiar to this part of Canada, the most rapidly increasing in population, whose educational future is proportionately, therefore, of such great import. The English are coming, but they are the worst farming settlers of all, as a head of an immigration department declares; he has hopes for the second generation of them. Then there are his best classes of settlers, set so far asunder in Europe, by location, race and religion; these are Swedes and Galician Poles. Most of the latter are Catholics. The Catholics are about one-quarter in all the new Alberta and Saskatchewan.

It is concerning the Catholics and their school rights that there has arisen once more the old spectre of sectarian animosity, hovering over the passions of the multitude, the fears of Rome, the suspicions of anti-clericalism, the visions of secular freedom and progress, all the mingled misunderstanding and injustice which this great matter excites and reveals. And then came the question of the rights of minorities and their privileges, and on the other side the question of provincial rights against the central Ottawa government.

Canada—it is so easy to forget—is a federal union. The provinces have, to speak generally, the power to make their own education laws. And from British Columbia at the extreme west, with its absolutely secular school system, through Alberta and Saskatchewan, with modified separate schools, to Manitoba's partly rejected compromise, and to Ontario's and Quebec's Catholic and non-Catholic schools entirely distinct, and so to the maritime provinces and their accepted compromise of some separation under uniform public control, there are of school systems in the Dominion a great if not charming variety.

With astonishment one read last February Sir Wilfred Laurier, the Prime Minister's, speech establishing the two new provinces and making therein provision for separate schools. For this was the Mr. Laurier who from 1890 to 1896 opposed the Catholic minority's claim in Manitoba to have their separate schools restored. This earlier school fight, the Manitoban, has been in every one's mind during the recent battles, not only because of one late explosive thrown from Winnipeg to Ottawa—whose contents we shall examine later on—but also because the interval has marked out a period, as it were, when racial and creed antagonisms have been latent, until now, when they are renewed, parties and leaders seem to have made volte-face. Those who were for Manitoba's separate schools are against the separate schools of Alberta and Saskatchewan. How is this? How is it that Sir Wilfred Laurier seems now the champion of what he crushed a decade of years ago?

His position, he says, is plain. He stands by the constitution in each case. As already stated, the Canadian provinces have the power to make their school systems, but with this proviso, that they do not transgress the British North America Act of 1867, the Constitution, the Imperial Act, by which the modern Canada began its life, with the eastern and central provinces. Now this act lays down that any educational right enjoyed by a minority by law in any province coming into confederation cannot be taken away. Therefore the Protestant minority in Quebec (the former Lower Canada) —in whose interest this provision was first made—and the Catholic minority in Ontario (the former Upper Canada), since they both had separate schools by law, kept them. Therefore the maritime provinces, which had not such schools by law, lost them.

A few years later (1870) Manitoba came into the confederation. Those who framed the Manitoba act inserted a clause that if separate schools existed by law *or practice* they had the right to be continued. That was all in favor of a Protestant minority then in Manitoba. But the Protestants there became the majority, and in 1890 the Manitoba Legislature abolished separate schools. The upshot of the consequent appeals to the highest judicial court, the Privy Council of England, was that the Manitoba Legislature had the power to abolish at least the State payment made to separate schools and to abolish also the right of the supporters thereof to have their taxes go to separate schools' support. The act, as was held, gave no more to the Catholic—he was the person concerned—than the right to establish his own separate or voluntary schools. The Catholic settler certainly thus had a grievance, having now, for conscience's sake, to pay double school taxes; and he had the right to appeal to the Ottawa federal government for relief. He did appeal. The Conservative government proposed a bill for his relief. The Liberals, under Mr. Laurier, opposed this remedial bill. And Mr. Laurier (become Sir Wilfred) got into power on this opposition policy in 1896. He had maintained that the constitution gave Manitoba no guaranteed right to separate schools, and that the remedial bill was merely *recommended* by the Privy Council, and as a matter of fact could not be enforced in the province. Therefore, "Hands off Manitoba!" That was his cry. The letter of the law was on the Liberal-Laurier side. Yet the men who had framed the Manitoba act had indeed protested they thought they were guaranteeing the minority a right to separate schools. "We [when passing the Manitoba act] certainly intended that the Catholics of Manitoba, or whatever denomination might be in the minority, should have the right to establish and maintain their own schools . . . and be absolutely sure of protection. You see

the words 'or practice' were inserted in the Manitoba act so that the difficulty that arose in New Brunswick, where separate schools actually existed, but were not recognized by the law, should not be repeated in Manitoba." However, the Privy Council gave its interpretation. And Sir Wilfred Laurier can say he had the letter of the law on his side. And that is the question.

Again he declares how he stood for the constitution when in 1889 the Quebec Legislature gave $400,000 to the Jesuits and $60,000 to the Protestant Board of Education—the property, as it all was, of the Jesuits, confiscated when Canada passed to the English, but now, a century after, restored. That restitution was within the power of the province of Quebec, and the present Liberal Prime Minister claims he was but consistent in joining with his Conservative predecessor of that day in refusing to overrule the provincial Jesuits' estates act.

But to-day it is otherwise. The Northwest Territories, about to be provinces, have had separate schools by law.

What were the separate school laws of these Territories? In 1870 they had as Territories come under the Canadian constitution, and in 1875 the following was made law:

> The minority of ratepayers, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish separate schools therein; and in such latter cases the ratepayers establishing such Protestant and Roman Catholic separate schools shall be liable only to assessment of such rates as they may impose upon themselves in respect thereof.

In these Territories in 1884 and succeeding years certain "ordinances" were passed modifying this separate school law; religious teaching was forbidden before 3 o'clock. However, a board was established of six Protestants and six Catholics, and to the Catholic members was left much of the control of the Catholic schools.

By the 1892 ordinance responsibility and control of educational policy was vested in the government, a result of the movement against clerically controlled schools. The protests to-day of the Archbishop of St. Boniface are directed, as we shall see, against the taking away of rights dating from 1902.

In 1901 a commissioner of education was appointed; and religious teaching was forbidden before 3.30.

So Sir Wilfred Laurier and his government, when bringing in the 1905 autonomy bill forming the new Northwest provinces, found in these Territories separate schools, but not with such practice therein as exists in the separate schools of Ontario and Quebec. Here in the Northwest Territories the only separation in textbooks was the permission of alternative readers in the first two grades. Still a Catholic minority paid its taxes to schools where

Catholic children went to be taught under Catholic teachers. That was the law. Therefore, said the Ottawa government, these Territories fall under the British North America act; they have had separate schools by law, and we have only to continue to them the same. It is an intelligible position. I am within the constitution for the third time, Sir Wilfred Laurier maintained; I am quite consistent.

He proposed then, as follows, the clauses having to do with this minority school matter:

> The minority of the ratepayers, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish separate schools and make the necessary assessment and collection of rates therefor.
>
> In such case the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools shall be liable to assessment of such rates as they impose upon themselves in respect therefor.
>
> In the appropriation of public moneys by the Legislature in aid of education and in the distribution of any moneys paid to the government of the provinces, arising from the school fund established by the Dominion Lands Act, there shall be no discrimination between the public schools and the separate schools, and such moneys shall be applied to the support of public and separate schools in equitable shares or proportions.

This proposal, as is seen, copied the wording of the 1875 law. It was withdrawn, and the following was passed:

> Nothing in any such law [now to be passed] shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to separate schools which any class of persons have at the date of the passing of this act.
>
> In the appropriation by the Legislature or distribution by the Government of the Province of any money for the support of schools . . . there shall be no discrimination against schools [as] described.

Why were the first proposed clauses withdrawn? Because the Minister of the Interior, Mr. Sifton, resigned. He had been in the Manitoba ministry during their fighting against separate schools. His contention was that the clauses as proposed were so vague that if in the future one of these new provinces were to vote money for a provincial university it could not, if petitioned, refuse voting money for a separate university as well. There were rumors of further resignations in the Cabinet. And the agitation in Toronto especially grew much stronger, of course, against the "trail of the Jesuit" being laid over the Northwest; against the throttling of liberties; against the burdening of generations to come; against the sowing of dissension. The amended clauses passed by a large majority. There was a clear Protestant majority for them, all the members for Nova Scotia (who, a unit for Laurier, are most of them Protestants) voting *pro*, as well as the almost solidly Laurier and Catholic province of Quebec. Ontario divided, its anti-Laurier (not large) Conservative majority voting *con*. The Northwest itself voted in majority *pro*.

What is implied in the clause as passed? In the legal opinion read by the Minister of Justice, Mr. Fitzpatrick:

Under the ordinances [passed, as we said, in the Territories, 1884—1901, and in force at the passing of the Autonomy Bills, establishing the new provinces] no rights or privileges exist with respect to separate schools as contrasted with public schools, except the initial right of effecting the separation.

This right, he goes on to state, carries with it the right of the minority to elect Catholic trustees, who choose Catholic teachers. What applies in all this to a Catholic minority would apply, *ipso facto*, to a Protestant one.

This opinion of the scope of the first draft and the second draft of the clauses and their relation to each other has not passed unchallenged. The Prime Minister of the Northwest, Mr. Haultain, was opposed to the first and to the second also. He maintains there is no sure distinction between them. The first draft gave the 1875 act unmodified by the 1892 ordinances. But it might be so modified, and so might come to mean the everlasting establishing of schools as they are. The second draft gives the 1875 act as modified by 1892; but the modification may be withdrawn, and we may have separate schools forever in the fuller Quebec and Ontario sense—separate training, separate inspection, separate text-books. The Orangemen met and judged that the first draft is even as the second. They noted, after their manner, that the bill was drafted by three Catholic Ministers—the Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice and the Secretary of State, the Hon R. W. Scott. Their grand master, Dr. Sproule, the champion of his society in Parliament, telegraphed that the "amendments proposed as a compromise are fully as objectionable as original clauses." Dr. Sproule is consistent. He voted against his own Conservative party when it was for the Manitoba Catholic minority, and then helped the Mr. Laurier in opposition that he now combats in office. He may seize on constitutional arguments, but he and his frankly act against le cléricalisme, voilà l'ennemi. So his more able predecessor, the late Mr. Dalton McCarthy, voted in the federal parliament for revising the provincial Quebec legislation in favor of the Jesuits and their estates, while he voted against revising the provincial Manitoba legislation disfavoring the Catholic schools. Both those acts of provinces were legally within provincial rights. Could the former Orange leader have brought himself to-day to vote for the separate school clauses, opposition to which is not within provincial rights? One has a claim thus to say that here absolutely and to ask the question, because Mr. McCarthy in 1894 wanted by federal act to get rid of the separate school clauses in the 1875 Territories act. The suggestion has been made, perhaps not with foundation, that he not only wished to abolish the separate schools, even as modified by 1892, but also feared lest if they existed

"by law" at the moment when the Territories became provinces, such schools could be legally protected by the British North America act. He is acknowledged by all to have been a far-seeing, clear-minded lawyer.

However, be that as it may, we cannot help having a certain sympathy, if not with the Orangemen, yet with the speech of Mr. Fielding, Minister of Finance, formerly Prime Minister of Nova Scotia, who wished men could take this school question out of the lawyers' arena. It is something so intimately touching upon people's feelings, their traditions, their family life, their religion, their contentment as citizens, and, further, there is something so hopeless in trying to make men agree with regard to it, that a statesman will not say have I not the right herein to make my people miserable, but is it not my interest to make them happy? Mr. Fielding himself would wish to see the children of citizens studying and playing together without considering their various religions. But Catholics, as he reflected, are 41 per cent. of the Canadian population; it is politically impossible to act in continual hostility to such a number; were it possible, it would be undesirable, and it would be unjust. A Protestant himself, he appealed to his co-religionists to take things as they are. He spoke of the compromises at which neutral forbearance had arrived in the maritime provinces. In his own city of Halifax, with a population somewhat less than half Catholic, the Catholic and the Protestant children go to different schools, though of course the public school secular law of the province prevails. The Archbishop builds the schools and leases the building to the School Board, who appoint Catholic teachers, many of whom are nuns. The text-books are drawn up by a committee, on which are some Catholic priests, and these books are used by Protestant and Catholic schools alike. Religious teaching can be given only before or after school hours. The Catholic schools have often many religious pictures and statues. The school buildings are surmounted by the cross. All this by custom, by live-and-let-live.

In New Brunswick, in three larger towns, something of the same compromise has been agreed to. In Prince Edward Island, the third maritime province, it obtains in only one school for boys. The Catholics there have asked for an extension of the system, as in the "island's" two neighbors. In country parts throughout these old provinces Catholics are often in settlements apart, as are settlers of other religions. The teacher then is Catholic, and the school question raises no difficulty. The arrangement, such as it is, has no force of law.

In the new provinces the new law sanctions this, and something more. "If Manitoba had had such schools as the bill proposes for

the Northwest"—separate, but under public control, with restriction of hours of religious teaching—"there would have been no Manitoba school question," said (in April, 1905) Mr. Greenway, the former Manitoba Minister who abolished the Catholic schools there. But, by the way, he might have remembered that not now, under his law in Manitoba, have they separation of religious denominations during ordinary school hours, as provided for in the Northwest bills.

However, these compromises or settlements have been alluded to here in order to show what could be done by those who sought peace yet respected the principles (the prejudices even, as they say) of their opponents.

But why, then, it was asked, do we not leave the settlement of this whole school matter to the provinces? Why not "Hands off, Alberta and Saskatchewan?" Well, as far as this is satisfying perhaps I have made the legal answer clear by explaining Sir Wilfred Laurier's varied action and, before him, the action of the Manitoba act framers in 1871, because of what had just happened in New Brunswick. At the risk of wearying readers it is to be repeated that New Brunswick (and the other maritime provinces) had had no separate schools "by law;" therefore the British North America act did not protect the schools the Catholics had there, and the Manitoba Catholic schools found themselves not protected by the letter of the law of the Manitoba act ostensibly framed to protect them.[2] But in this present case of the Northwest Catholics may say, why should we leave our schools to the local legislature? No court has decided that we at least are not protected by the British North America act declaring that minority schools existing "by law" when a province enters the union shall be therein assured. We had our schools by law. Why should we not, like any other citizens, claim the support of the law, and not be asked to waive our rights merely to allay irrational irritation and suspicion and injustice? And, further, as Burke says, the genuine love of liberty is extremely rare. It is putting no exceptional shame on the Protestant majority in the Northwest if Catholics would rather have the case settled in the federal parliament. They need not charge all the opponents of their schools with being fanatical irreligious bigots, *sectaries*. But allowing that all the opposition comes from

---

2 An intimate friend of the late Dr. Grant's writes—Dr. Grant was principal of Queen's University, the most prominent Presbyterian minister in Canada, and moderate on the Manitoba matter—"I think the late Principal Grant was a good prophet when he said that after the action of the Greenway Government in Manitoba in 1890 the people of the Dominion would never have confidence in provincial governments doing what was right by the minority."

honest enthusiasm for the unity of the nation by bringing up its youth together, or from honest desire for a generous education and efficiency of teaching, together with suitable material surroundings; even allowing all this—and the present writer is far from refusing to admit how much good sense and right feeling there is in it—Catholics know, as everybody else knows, that these education matters touch ideals of life and conduct about which it is impossible to obtain agreement between Catholics and many non-Catholics, and which ideals imply opportunities therefore for dealing with life and conduct in relation to religion and under direction from Catholics, throughout the earlier times of education at least. To have sympathy for that with which you do not agree is often noble, but it is hard; it is much harder to understand that other side sufficiently to have any sympathy with it. We err in a thousand ways negatively, when we do not err positively, if we attempt to legislate for our neighbor. Take the religious census of the population of these Northwest Territories in 1901, and what would be the probable chances of the Catholics? To-day that population is four times as great, but the proportion of Catholics is not higher—about one-quarter of the present half million. Join the Anglicans, and you will still be 50,000 short of a half. And the Anglicans are not even as sure allies in Canada as they have been in England; and that is not very sure. Their late respected Archbishop of Rupert's Land, Dr. Machray, did not indeed favor Manitoba's resistance to the remedial bill, and the organ of his Church wrote that "Roman Catholics want, and rightly so, to surround their children all day long and every day with an atmosphere of religion. They want not merely to impress upon their young people's minds certain important dogmas, but so to fill them with a sense of close relationship that ought to exist between these dogmas and the conduct of their everyday lives that they will grow up Christian men and women." It is well said. And yet it must be noted that the Anglican ministers assembled this year in the Northwest added one more to the other Protestant ministerial memorials in favor of leaving the school matters to the new local governments. Would the Catholics have then got more than they got in Manitoba, which is far from being what the Anglican paper just quoted suggested, and is merely the permission to have Catholic teachers in minority schools if that is the desire of a certain number? The Northwest now has to give by federal law not only Catholic teachers, but Catholic schools. And really, as cannot be too often recalled for the moment, the Manitoba settlement was not encouraging for those who might be tempted to yield to the appeal, "trust the provinces." What has happened in Manitoba since 1896? The burden has been

great on those who, as in the United States, have there to support two sets of schools. Much sympathy has been expressed for the suffering minority, but

> I never yet did hear
> That the bruised heart was pierced through the ear.

We are very sorry, but we cannot help you, has been the refrain of the answer given by the powerful, as each fresh effort has been made to get better terms for the weak. In March, 1900, a Catholic appeal to the School Board stated that in Winnipeg 700 Catholic children were attending the separate schools, and 200 of them not attending any schools at all; and that the separate schools, spite of every effort, were heavily in debt. The separate school teachers had now certificates, they said, from the provincial department of education, and the Catholics offered to accept the public school system of inspection. They asked the Board to retain the Catholic teachers, to pay them and to bear the expense of equipping the schools, very much what is given by custom in larger towns in the maritime provinces and by law in Alberta and Saskatchewan. But always negotiations have broken against the clause of the Laurier-Greenway settlement, "No separation of pupils by religious denominations shall take place during the secular school work." All the facts have been recalled in the press hostile to the Laurier Northwest proposal for separate schools, and hence it may be inferred that in it there is a sign of how this press would urge the new provinces to act if they were left free. And the Catholic minimum did demand this very separation during school hours. Mgr. Sbaretti, the Papal Delegate, this year asked the Manitoba Ministry —of the opposite party, too, to the Ministry that took the Manitoba separate schools away—to give concessions; this separation of pupils was among them. His request was rejected—in circumstances to be mentioned later, that revealed the depths of feelings, passions, hopes and fears roused by debating over the schools.

To sum up, the new provinces are not being left free to deal with education as the first law guarantees they shall be, because the law adds subject to the British North America act, the which gives minority schools, if they are already existing by law. Further, the examples before them do not encourage the Catholics to trust their non-Catholic fellow-citizens who may honestly or fanatically disapprove of Catholic education or misunderstand it. And this, though so much may be said for efficiency gained by public inspection and control.

And now, as a further revelation, it is no wonder that on their side the non-Catholics, or secularists, fight, for they have good reason to know there is strong Catholic opposition to any compro-

mise at all and to any public control. Again, we connect the Manitoba question with the present one. What can be stronger than these words of the Archbishop of St. Boniface (Winnipeg) with regard to the earlier and later questions within his ecclesiastical province? And what can be more like in tone?

> No Catholic can approve of these schools unless he wishes to cut himself off from the Church. . . . We wish [? *voulons:* which is much more] (1) control of our schools; (2) Catholic school districts everywhere; (3) Catholic histories and reading books; (4) Catholic inspection; (5) competent Catholic teachers instructed by us; (6) our taxes and exemption from taxes for other schools.
>
> The Remedial Bill [of the Conservatives, opposed by Mr. Laurier, 1896, and defeated through his French Canadian Catholic following] gave us all that in principle. . . . But what has been given us in its place? Not one of our sacred rights, not a single one.

In those words Archbishop Langevin judges the Manitoba "settlement." And in the same number of this REVIEW (January, 1898) there may be read Pope Leo XIII., who, if he did not say what the Archbishop said, yet declared that "the law made to remedy the evil is defective, imperfect, insufficient." The Pope continued, however: "As to what regards particularly the Catholics of Manitoba, we have confidence that, God helping, they will one day obtain full satisfaction. This confidence is founded, above all, on the goodness of their cause; next, on the justice and wisdom of those who govern, and lastly, on the good-will of all upright Canadians. In the meantime, until they succeed in their claims, let them not refuse [this] partial satisfaction. Under your authority"—he is writing to the Canadian Bishops after receiving Cardinal (then Mgr.) Merry del Val's report—"and with the help of those who direct your schools, a complete course of studies ought to be carefully devised. Special care should be taken that those who are employed as teachers should be abundantly provided with all the qualities, natural and acquired, which are requisite for their profession. It is only right that Catholic schools, both in their educational methods and in the standard of their teaching, should be able to compete with the best. *From the standpoint of intellectual culture and progress the design conceived by the Canadian provinces for the development of public instruction, for the raising of the standard of education and making it daily more refined and perfect, must assuredly be allowed to be honorable and noble.*"

The Archbishop of St. Boniface, as has just been said, now uses with regard to Alberta and Saskatchewan almost the words that he used ten years ago with regard to Manitoba:

> We learn with unspeakable sorrow that the educational clause destined to be inserted in the Autonomy Bill of the two new Provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan will not restore us to the position we held in 1875, when the Northwest Territories were organized in virtue of the British North America Act, but that this clause will conserve the spoliation of our school rights by the ordinance of 1892, and will sanction all ordinances passed up to 1901.

This is for us a cruel disappointment and a source of great sadness and grave anxiety for the future. The spoliation of 1892 will thus be definitely confirmed and conserved, and we lose all hope of recovering our rights, we who expected this act of justice and high wisdom, as well as of true patriotism, from our rulers at Ottawa.

In 1873 we had the same school rights as the Protestant minority of Quebec and the Catholic minority of Ontario; and these rights, shamefully violated in spite of the Constitution, as the lamented Archbishop Taché so well proved in his memorial of 1904[3] ["A Page of the History of the Schools of Manitoba During Seventy-five Years," 1893], will not be recognized and restored to us, as we had reason to expect, by Parliament, which had power to do so.

Catholics who express satisfaction at such a state of things betray not only unpardonable ignorance of Catholic educational principles, but also a lack of understanding of the painful position in which we are (*sic*) placed since 1892—ostracized, as we truly are, in the Territories.

Wherefore, reverend and dear brethren, we deem it our duty to raise our voice in protest against this ignoring of school rights, which the Constitution of our country gives us. Our rights are as sacred and as certain to-day as they were in 1875. And if some opportunists were [to be] tempted to ask us to be silent for the sake of peace; or because it is impossible now to recover our rights, we would answer: "There can be no peace except with justice." There can be no prescription against right. No question of principle is truly settled except when it is settled according to justice and equity.

Our cause is that of justice and peace, because it is the cause of conscience and truth; and truth, like God, never dies.[4]

---

[3] Archbishop Taché died in 1894.

[4] Dr. Bryce, a Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada, formerly Moderator of the Presbyterian General Assembly, and head of the faculty of science in the University of Manitoba (consisting of colleges of various religions, including Catholic), declared on May 29 to a Toronto *Globe* reviewer that "there is no discontent in the Northwest over the educational settlement according to the second draft of the autonomy bills: the almost universal testimony is that the Territories want the continuation of their present school system," as guaranteed by these bills. "That has been formally expressed by the unanimous election of Hon. Mr. Oliver, of Edmonton. . . . This temper on the part of the western people is, of course, discouraging for the educational doctrinaires, who wish to dominate us with their notions. The only coercion in sight is that of a narrow-minded handful in Toronto, who wish to coerce our western people into an agitation that is distasteful to them. There is a feeling of resentment against the interference of these Toronto dictators. . . . A public school system—pure and simple—is impossible in Canada. In Winnipeg city to-day, fifteen years after the passing of our (Manitoba) act, we have the Roman Catholics still dissatisfied. They are paying taxes towards the support of the public schools, and are maintaining parochial schools of their own. This is undesirable. Then, sixty or seventy of their schools in country places, nominally public schools, are, it is declared (but this is denied by the Manitoban Minister, Mr. Rogers), being conducted as separate schools. This again is undesirable. It is because I am well acquainted with the Territories and their school system that I am confident that their method is the best yet devised for approximating to uniformity, and yet giving a certain diversity to allow for religious instruction and religious sentiment."

A recent letter from the Northwest itself expresses some Liberal Protestant feeling thence, if not Catholic also:

"Regarding the school question, as you are aware, I am in favor of national schools, and think the Catholics hide their light under a bushel when they persist in keeping to themselves so exclusively in this matter, and consequently are very much misunderstood by some, or rather many Protestants, as to their religion.

"The curious part of the controversy to me is this, that in the west there is practically no controversy, as we are getting exactly what we have had since 1901, which has given satisfaction to both Protestants and Catholics.

The protest could be imagined which the Archbishop would direct against the Toronto *Globe* writer, quoted in the London *Tablet* for March 18, 1905, to the effect that "It will be seen, therefore, that

As long as certain Protestant ministers thought that Sir Wilfred Laurier was treading on his Catholic co-religionists [? *in re* Manitoba] they were of the opinion that he was all right; but as soon as the Prime Minister gives his co-religionists what they are entitled to by the law of the land, they evidently think he is a very bad man. . . . The father of the present school laws in the Territories is the Hon. Frank Oliver, Minister of the Interior, who introduced the bill in the Regina House in 1901, when he represented this district in the Territorial House. . . . All the schools are public schools; all have the same course of study, and all are inspected by the same public school inspector. The word separate school is a misnomer, therefore, when applied to the school system of the Northwest Territories.

"The system works out in this manner. In case a community is settled by Catholics, if a school is established, it is called a public school, and any Protestants in said community can send their children to the same. The last half-hour of each day is or may be given over to religious instruction. In case the Protestants in the community do not desire to send their children to this school, they may, if they wish, build a school of their own, which is then called a 'separate school.' It is a public school, however; has the same course as the Catholic school, and the same inspector, and may have religious instruction from 3.30 to 4, if so desired; but the children need not stay if their parents object. The taxes are levied on those who attend each school; that is, the Catholics pay for their school and the Protestants for theirs. There is no double taxation on either body.

"In case a community is Protestant, the first school established is called the public school; and then if the Catholics do not want to attend it they establish their own school, which is called a 'separate school,' but has the same course and same inspector as 'the Protestant public school,' as stated above.

"You will readily see that the State controls both schools; and they are both public schools, and still not what good Catholics would or can call 'Godless schools.'

"There are over one thousand schools ['Catholic public' and 'Protestant public'] in the Northwest Territories, established since this law came in force in 1901, eleven of which are so-called 'separate schools.' Four of these eleven are in the country districts; two of these are Protestant separate schools and two Catholic separate schools. The remaining seven are established in the towns, and these seven are Catholic separate schools—but all public schools, nevertheless.

"We have lived under this system since 1901, and have been very happy, not knowing that we had a grievance. No kick of any kind was made until Sir Wilfred Laurier, a Catholic, undertook to endorse or establish for all time the public school system that we ourselves made. His great fault in the Conservatives' eyes is that he is a Catholic and in power, and they want power, and do not care how they abuse or misrepresent him, while at the same time their leader introduces a private, not a party, amendment to a bill which, as regards the schools, gives perfect satisfaction to the west.

"If any one has a grievance, it is the Catholics, as it would appear under the British North America Act they are entitled to Church separate schools. But the laity of the Catholic Church in the west like the present system of public schools, as they know that their children in receiving public school instruction are better educated in commercial matters. . . .

"Yes, immigration is very large. There is no school question in the west.

"You can use the contents of this letter, but not my name, please, as I am a Government official and have no opinions any more for the public."

there are complaints on both sides, as is likely to be the case under a compromise, but that on the whole no serious grievance exists that could not be satisfactorily ameliorated. The conferring on the provincial authorities of full power over education has not, therefore, led to any serious tyrannies or oppressions."

To be sure, we may admit that the ordinances may be legally done away with. But who can expect that result when the Northwest majority is probably destined to be Protestant? And not even Anglican-Protestant.

There is another revelation to be made, though that is too high a word. It is an allusion to what is such a tug-of-war—honest, if you like; amicable (at least supernaturally)—between the French and the English-speaking Catholics. Mr. Henry Bourassa—the first-rate and able speaker that he is—in parliamentary style, to match the Archbishop's circular letter to the clergy, came out with a protest against the amended Northwest education clause; on religious grounds, indeed, but also on the grounds that French language and tradition had now no chance. And they have little. Who could look without sympathy, if not regret, at the doom that seems awaiting in the Northwest the flocks of these French Oblate Fathers, worthy successors of those French Jesuits of 250 years ago, for whom Central Canada was the wild West? Such is the question we should be inclined to put. If there is any class of Canadians who look upon the destruction of the French language with equanimity, it is English-speaking Canadian Catholics, specially those of Irish descent. I mean the *official* French language. These English-speaking brethren will feel at rest only when French in Canada is like French in Louisiana. Its abolition as an official language in Manitoba they rejoice at. They would never vote for separate schools to teach French in Alberta and Saskatchewan. Both priests and laymen—and these the most religious—readily express their satisfaction with the settlement in Manitoba, not to say the Northwest. It hits the French hard, they allow, but they look at the uncompromising attitude of the Archbishop as partly French, and that dulls their sympathy with his Catholicity; it is indeed partly in the interests of a united Catholicism that they wish for the disappearance of French. This may be a mystery to those who are Europeans. Perhaps it is better understood by all Americans, specially in the country, of the effort made by Herr Cahensly, so enthusiastically supported by the pious and trenchant French-Canadian editor of *La Vérité*, the late Mr. Tardivel. But whether this French-English struggle be understood or not, sympathized with or not, to ignore it would be to make the full view of the Catholic situation in Canada impossible. For all they do not make

a stir, and though there be nothing audible but the steady breathing in strife, yet all the same two bull dogs holding on are in not less grave conflict than are the fussy barkers, the terriers of the sects. Only when the French are hopelessly beaten, as now seemingly in Manitoba, does the English-speaking brother express a certain pitying regard with, "O, well, they lost their chance when they turned to the New England States and placed their million there instead of in Northwest Canada." Very true; and the consequences are hard to bear and harder still the outlook.

What is more surprising still is the persistent attitude of the "English" Catholics towards the French in Quebec province and part of Ontario; there where the French are firmly entrenched—at bay, too often; little wonder—and where it is inconceivable that even for generations to come they can be dislodged. Yet in schools and colleges the English boys and young men learn French but imperfectly, if at all. They simply won't learn it, a Jesuit Father said to me concerning his foolish boys. Signs by, as we say in Ireland, many places go to the French, because tramway conductors have to be bi-lingual, and there is prestige for an orator who can beat another in a language which is not his mother tongue. The Irish Canadians, having lost their own language, sadly grudge the French Canadians theirs and sit chafing at the bi-linguists instead of being up doing like them. The French doubtless feel that they have had to fight for their lives, and will have to fight. They have the suspicions, the doggedness, the aggressiveness often of a minority. But dislodge them from Central Canada, and even from the maritime provinces, where they are increasing faster than others—impossible! They number a third of Canada's population, and though they decrease in proportion to others, they possess the St. Lawrence, Quebec and Montreal, not to say half Ottawa. They have traditions, they are deep rooted in Canadian soil, they have their heart in the country perhaps more than any; they have a literature, a history beyond all comparison more stirring than others can show; they were the pioneers; they have tenacity now and solidity, a real national life. No apology is needed for trying to impress on all readers of ecclesiastical Canada the intensity of the French feeling and the factor it must be in every just judgment passed on such questions as Canadian Catholic education.

Have we, then, seen the last separate school question in Canada? Archbishop Langevin gave us an answer for the Northwest. And it is difficult to ignore those who will not be ignored. Will the French Catholics of New Brunswick, if they come to be a majority in that province, or even a strong, united minority—they have made extraordinary strides out of obscurity in a generation—will they

live under the present New Brunswick school law? On the other hand, the secularists in Ontario, and the coming French secularists in Quebec, will they not strive to break these rights of separate schools in their provinces? Passionate planning to have one's own way in this matter soon gets to work when any chance is given to rouse fear of Church in State. And of this there was a fine example over the very matter in hand. It makes a story in itself, but it is most suggestive with regard to the modern mistrust of clerical influence, the latent hostility to Rome, the clashing of older and newer ideas of public recognition of religion in the school as in the Senate.

Not that Mgr. Sbaretti, the Papal Delegate, had schemes or plans that were terrifying, but some there were who readily feared he had and others exploited the fears; and even Catholic priests were far from unanimously feeling comfortable about the churchman's discretion or being pleased with his interference. His action was simply as follows: Once more it connects the Manitoba question of ten years ago with to-day. Making himself the not unnatural spokesman of the Catholic minority in Manitoba, he asked a member of the government in that province to come to see him in Ottawa. This Mr. Campbell was in the capital on a mission to try to induce the federal government to extend Manitoba's boundaries up to Hudson's Bay, an extension that is being considered also by Ontario, which fact it is essential here to keep in mind, for it was a reason for not hastily deciding to grant the wish of Manitoba. Mgr. Sbaretti's object was to get better terms if possible for the Manitoba Catholics. He told his provincial ministerial acquaintance that it would be "politically expedient" for his government to do something in this direction, seeing that the Catholics in the territory that Manitoba covets have objected to becoming part of that province and subject to its school law. As was told us long ago by Mr. Edward Blake (when he was in the Canadian Parliament), proposing settlers had asked for assurances about what they thought school freedom before being willing to come into the Canadian Northwest. Mr. Campbell asked the Delegate to give him in writing what the Catholics would accept as a minimum of change in the school law. The writing was given; it named not only religious instruction and Catholic teachers, but also separation of pupils by denominations; all this, if there were fifteen Catholic pupils in a village or thirty in a town whose parents or guardians should petition for the change. Mgr. Sbaretti's requests were not granted. So much for the facts.

Then appeared a long sensational article by a Mr. Rogers, another member of the Manitoba government. To judge by his con-

duct, he merits the one Shakespearean adjective for a politician. The world understood him to say that Mgr. Sbaretti sent for him and Mr. Campbell on February 20, on which day they met the Delegate, who offered as his price for being bought off the changes in the Manitoba act above mentioned; otherwise Sir Wilfred Laurier, who, of course, had consulted the lieutenant of the Pope about the matter, would punish the too Protestant Manitoba by refusing extension of her boundary. Mr. Rogers was firm against Italian wiles, as he takes care to let us understand, and on February 20 they left the Papal Delegate, who then communicated with *his* delegate, the Prime Minister; and the next day, February 21, Sir Wilfred's speech was made, and the honest Manitoba Ministers went home glorious, but defeated. "A natural, though corrupt Love, of the *Lie* it selfe" seems to have possessed Conservative-scheming Mr. Rogers. For sooner or later he would have to be found out. However, he thought to raise the waters, as he certainly did. The ringing of the changes on their poor half dozen notes, "insolent and insidious," "insidious and insolent," "insolent and atrocious," "atrocious and insolent," "atrocious, insolent and ungrateful," "ungrateful, insolent and atrocious"—all about "the Popish aggression"—in the England of half a century back; all "the old, old ding-dong which has scared town and country this weary time" was echoed in belated Toronto. It is living in a fool's paradise, said the once Laurier-supporting *Globe*, not to recognize that separate schools are just what the country will not have. It is monstrous, said the opposition leader, that the head of the government gets his orders from the Pope. Send the Pope's legate packing, cried the rank and file. Many Catholics would have given him his papers.

At last Mgr. Sbaretti made a statement: (a) He never saw this Mr. Rogers at all. (b) He did say it would be "politically expedient" for Manitoba to give school concessions; else the other Northwest Catholics, of whom he was the representative, would not be willing to become Manitobans. (c) He had no communication with the government. (d) Lastly, to crown all, the interview with Mr. Campbell took place, not on February 20, but on February 23, two days *after* the speech of the Prime Minister, on February 21, refusing the extended boundary to Manitoba; which ministerial speech, Mr. Rogers said, was the result of the previous rebuff he gave Mgr. Sbaretti at the interview which never took place, as far as he was concerned, at all, which did take place with Mr. Campbell *after* Manitoba's fate was decided.

But whoever thinks "l'affaire Sbaretti" has not excited fruitful anti-Popery knows little of the latent hostility to clerical influence and of the rankling suspicion that remains and of the determination to fight for claims such as the claims of the Liberals are to be

at the coming elections in England: (1) Public control, (2) no religion taught, (3) no questions raised of the teacher's belief. Men are going to prison in England for these claims. Cheap heroes some say, but we shall doubtless see at the elections that their going to prison, if it pays them, pays also their party and their cause. Theirs is a popular cause in many a country, and its popularity gains. We Catholics may think it will ruin itself; that it is ruining itself by its own results here, for instance, in America; but it has a long course to run. Who will deny it? And it behooves us to see what are the weaknesses that we ourselves show and have shown. The words quoted above from Leo XIII. hint plainly that if we have cared for the efficiency of our schools, yet we have not cared enough. Look at the "Church" [Anglican] schools in England. And how many of them fell when inspected? How many Catholic schools there despaired, before 1902, of keeping up to the standard for health and comfort of pupils, for light, air and warmth? In France do we not listen constantly to sneering by good priests, or witness their shoulder shrugging at the unnecessary and unseemly excellence or splendor of the republic's school and college buildings? These things ought ye to have done and not to have left the others undone applies all round. And because we think secular schools cannot do what is most essential, it is very absurd to talk therefore about their learning being "so called," when it may be excellent learning, and when there may be a question of such and such branches of study which without expensive equipment are an impossibility.

To combine public control with liberty of soul and mind is the noble ideal which is before us. We are living, in the United States, amidst those who have done among the incoming masses a most marvelous work by the instrument of the public schools. We should never shut our minds to the fact that those who are the most illiterate are so often Catholics. They may not be debased—far from it—they may not be ignorant in very many respects; but they are helpless without instruction in these days—helpless at least to rise. We should never cry up popular instruction as a need, and also decry our neighbors who have done more for it than have many of our brethren. Ruskin had much good sense in his wish never to teach a child how to read at all until he could be sure what the child was going to read. And happier in this world and in the next is the lot of many a peasant girl as ignorant of reading as was Jeanne d'Arc. Still, as we all honestly know, these humors and dallyings with the olden time are not the business in hand. And when we return to Canada, if we do find that the *collèges* of Quebec turn out men who become bilingual orates, we find also that their

Catholic province is the most illiterate. Let us frankly say, do we think this desirable or do we not? Many a time, said a Jesuit rector to me, I have warned our people of the evil day coming, when without doubt education will be taken from the clergy; and it will be on the plea of insufficiency, a plea not specious, he maintained (as our polemics say it was in Manitoba), but a plea well grounded and justifiable. Nearly 39 per cent. of the teachers in the province of Quebec are religious; they need not be certificated. Nor in Ontario need the smaller religious number there be so—as yet. A decision is pending which will probably enforce certificates there on religious teachers as on others. And at least one Ontario Bishop has himself enforced them by his own authority. But we have been faulty, if not in soundness of learning, yet in worldly wisdom, by seeming to be unwilling that the world shall have a test of our teachers' good preparation and fitness. Explain it how we may, separate schools in Canada on the whole lack prestige. And the explanation is not far removed when we hear the same mouth boldly declaring that these schools are equal to any, and then whispering that we do the best we can in our poverty. Is poverty always present of necessity? But in any case, on which plea rests our case? We are convinced, certainly, that Herbert Spencer did see into the life of things when, at the end, he wrote:

"That right guidance may be furnished by a system of natural ethics is a belief naturally followed by the corrollary that it needs only to develop such a system, and the required self-control will result. But calm contemplation of men's natures and doings dissipate this corollary. So long as it will hold together, a society wicked in the extreme may be formed of men that in keenness of intellect rank with Mephistopheles, and conversely, though its members are stupid and unprogressive, a society may be full of happiness if its members are scrupulously regardful of one another's claims and actively sympathetic. This proposition, though a truism, is little regarded.

"Everywhere the cry is: Educate! Educate! Educate! Everywhere[5] the belief is that by such culture as schools furnish children, and therefore adults, can be moulded into the desired shapes. It is assumed that when men are taught what is right they will do what is right; that a proposition intellectually accepted will be morally operated. And yet this conviction, contradicted by every-day experience, is at variance with an every-day axiom, the axiom that each faculty is strengthened by the exercise of it. Were it fully understood that the emotions were the masters, and the intellect the servants, it would be seen that little can be done by improving the

[5] "Bate, I beeseech you, Mother Church."

servants while the master remains unimproved. Improving the servants does but give the masters more power of achieving their ends. But I must limit myself to the issue implied above—denying the commonly supposed connection between intellectual culture and moral improvements, and giving evidence that a society is not benefited but injured by artificially increasing intelligence without regard to character."

We see in those words a valuable result of positive study underpinning the faith we have been brought up in *a priori*. But then, all the more, we must have that divine discontent with imperfection in our methods whenever we fall short of the ideals of Pope Leo. And where is that not so in this imperfect world? It is certainly so in Canada.

Yet let us say a good word for ourselves in all this business, and especially for our French brethren of Quebec. They did not deny to their Protestant minority schools according to the Protestant mind. They themselves would not come into the Confederation until they had schools guaranteed according to their Catholic mind. Their position is an ever present obstacle in the path of those who would abolish Catholic separate schools in Protestant Ontario. The contrast would be too striking with the Protestant separate schools ungrudged in Catholic Quebec. Even though it is but fair to add that the Ontario minority schools are secular, and the Quebec majority schools are frankly Catholic. Still, to harp on this distinction is but pedantry, as long as your Catholic minority will no more go to a secular school than will your Protestant minority go to a school that is Catholic. The distinction is honestly felt, however, by many non-Catholics and as often ignored by Catholics, whose argument therefore never touches those who ignore our premises that a secular school is as un-Catholic as a Catholic school is un-Protestant. And it were to be wished that we thought of Newman's saying: "Most arguments are useless, because people don't agree about the premises."

Historically, nevertheless, we have no bad record in Canada. Before Confederation (1867) it was Sir A. T. Galt, a Protestant leader in Quebec, who said (October, 1864): "It was clear that in confiding the general subject of education to the local legislatures it was absolutely necessary it should be accompanied with such restrictions as would prevent injustice in any respect from being done to the minority." And he continued—his concluding words below being now a favorite Catholic quotation: "This applied to Lower Canada, but it also applied with equal force to Upper Canada and the other provinces; for in Lower Canada there was a Protestant minority, and in the other provinces a Catholic minority.

. . . . There could be no greater injustice to a population than to compel them to have their children educated in a manner contrary to their own religious belief." This promised well, and Sir John Rose could add to his fellow-politician's words that we, the English Protestant minority of Lower Canada, cannot forget that whatever right of separate education we have was accorded to us in the most unrestricted way before the union of the provinces, when we were in a minority and entirely in the hands of the French population. We cannot forget that in no way was there any attempt to prevent us educating our children in the manner we saw fit and deemed best; and I would be untrue to what is just if I forgot to state that the distribution of State funds for educational purposes was made in such a way as to cause no complaint on the part of the minority."

The result of the conflicting school interests and the needful safeguarding was that in the British North America act the clause 93 (often already referred to here) was inserted, guaranteeing that though "*in and for each province the Legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education,*" yet that that is subject to the condition that "*nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools, which any class of persons have by law in the province at the union.*" It seems impossible rightly to hold that that applies only to Quebec and Ontario and not to new provinces. Lord Carnarvon in 1866 gave his opinion: "The object of this clause is to secure to the religious minority of one province the same rights, privileges and protection which the religious minority of another province may enjoy. The Roman Catholics of Upper Canada [Ontario] and the Roman Catholic minority of the maritime provinces will thus stand on a footing of equality." That word of promise was kept by others to the ear only.

Things have worked out in such a way that, whatever be the instances of Catholic or French intolerance, we have repeated assurances that they are the exception, not the rule. A member of the Quebec Cabinet, Mr. Weir, spoke lately in Montreal: "I, being the son of a Scotch father and a Scotch mother, I, a Protestant, have always in this province seen not only our rights but our remotest wishes respected. I challenge any Protestant to say that he has ever been ill-treated. And therefore, when in the province of Ontario we see politicians and bigots appealing to racial and religious prejudices in order to deprive the minority of the rights to which they are constitutionally and logically entitled, it is our imperious duty to cry shame and to stigmatize them." "The English-speaking Protestants," wrote a Quebec lawyer (Toronto *Globe*,

April 12, in a letter "Let us have peace"), "who live among the French Canadians and are unblinded by the prejudices of race or creed, which unfortunately affect the judgment of some individual members of almost all communities, are compelled to blush, nay, to hang our heads in very shame for the violent and unjust appeals to racial and religious passions and prejudices, especially in the West, because of the very reasonable demands made on behalf of other minorities elsewhere. I could not, if I would, claim an utter absence of fanaticism for the entire population of Quebec, but I can and do most positively and most conscientiously aver that there is a general freedom on the part of the best element of the French Canadian population from a desire to do anything short of justice to their fellow-countrymen of other races and creeds. It is but simple fairness on my part to go further and to show, from a very few out of many illustrations of the fact which might be cited, that they are a generous as well as a just and chivalrous people."

A Protestant constituency in Toronto certainly elects a Catholic, Mr. A. Macdonnell. It is not quite fair, then, to say of Toronto Protestantism that it is still in the Belfast Age. But there are facts which may be recalled, when the French Catholics are being called bigots, by the Toronto *Evening Telegram:*

ONTARIO.

	Population.	No. M. P.'s entitled.	Actual No. M. P.'s.
Protestants	1,800,000	72	79
Catholics	370,000	14	7

So, in the Dominion Parliament, Catholics by proportion are entitled to 87 members; they have 72. And in the Provincial Parliament of Quebec Protestants by proportion are entitled to 8 members; they have 12.

The lawyer just quoted, Mr. E. T. D. Chambers, gives as instances of generosity: (a) That the Bar Association of the district of Quebec, which has only some fifteen English-speaking practitioners at present, out of a total membership of nearly 150, nevertheless elects alternately an English-speaking and a French-speaking bâtonnier; (b) that the English-speaking population of the city of Quebec—English, Scotch and Irish combined—numbers slightly over 10,000 out of a total of about 75,000. Yet the electors return nine English-speaking aldermen to the Council out of a total of thirty, or nearly one-third, although the English-speaking population is only one-seventh of the whole; (c) that for ten years the writer sat in the City Council of Quebec occupying one of the seats for St. Louis Ward, where the French vote far exceeds that of the English-speaking electors. Though twice opposed by French-Canadian candidates, he was never defeated, because of the general

understanding among the majority of the French Canadians of the ward that the English-speaking ratepayers, while in minority, were entitled to one of the seats.

"Is it any wonder," he concludes, "that we who live in the heart of this generous population should complain of the manner in which it is misrepresented and misconstrued by some of your Toronto and other western contemporaries?"

It must, I think, therefore be granted that in French Quebec a just spirit has prevailed. Even the hostile critic in the April *Queen's* [University] *Quarterly* (Kingston, Ont.), Professor James Cappon, recalls that when Quebec (though then the more populous) united with Ontario it agreed to equal representation; but that when Ontario became the more populous, Ontario called for representation by population. The French have words for this sort of thing, *déloyal, de mauvaise foi* and *la force prime le droit.* For the last, any way, we have *Might is right*—I fear with a tone in it less condemnatory.

Have I shown plainly by these concluding remarks that the French Canadians, with their experience as French and as Catholics, have been safeguarders of justice in voting for a federal guarantee for separate schools in the new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan?

Be it repeated, anyway, that they had with them finally a Protestant majority. We acknowledge Alberta and Saskatchewan's right to separate schools—such as they are—said the new Minister of the Interior, Mr. Frank Oliver, appointed instead of Mr. Sifton, resigned, but himself another Northwest Protestant and M. P. for Edmonton, Alberta's capital. I am no lover of separate schools, he answered to his Orange co-religionists' petition. But we are not *imposing* such schools, though you express it so; we are simply continuing a legal right. *Esto perpetuum.*

W. F. P. Stockley.

Halifax, N. S.

ANCIENT COMMERCE OF THE PHŒNICIANS IN THE MEDITERRANEAN.—PART II.

I.

IN A former article under the above title we described how all Phœnician merchants were driven from the Ægæan sea about B. C. 1327 by the people sometimes termed "Pelasgians," which compelled them to seek new markets in the west. Dr. Curtius says: "The Phœnicians had discovered the pole-star; the Phrygo-pelasgians [*i. e.*, "Mycenæans"] chose a brighter constellation, the Great Bear, but if they had not the same accuracy in their observations as their masters, they became in all else their disciples and successful rivals. They thus succeeded in driving them completely from their seas; hence it comes that so few traces of Phœnecian rule are found on the shores of the Ionian Sea."[1] In the legend of Danaos building a ship and sailing over seas, Greek tradition seems to point to Danaans[2] as the earliest seafarers of Greece, of whom they had any recollection. The fact that ships and scenes of the sea do not figure at all in their art representations seems to prove that in the beginning, at least, the authors of the "Mycenæan art" were not seafarers.[3] This is confirmed by Thucydides (1, 2), who says that in pre-Homeric times, owing to the constant migrations of the peoples in Hellas, there was no maritime commerce; every one carried arms for want of walled cities and safe roads (ib. ch. 6), to defend them against attacks from the sea; and they were content with bare subsistence. The Carians and Phœnicians, who were previously masters of the islands, "were pirates," and were driven from the Ægæan by Minos, King of Crete (ch. 4).

"For the Greeks of old, . . . when they began to have more intercourse with one another by sea, took to piracy for the sake of gain, . . . and plundered those who dwelt in unwalled towns and villages" (ch. 5). Once established along the deeply indented coasts of Greece, on the shores of a sea so studded with islands that one could traverse it without ever losing sight of land, the "Mycenæan" peoples naturally took to the new element. Commerce there must have been from the beginning, as tribe bartered with its

[1] "Griech. Geschichte," I., p. 37. Greek history proper dates from the first Olympiad (776 B. C.).

[2] Among the vassals of Tahutmes III. depicted in the temple at Karmak are "peoples of the isles of the Taanau," generally identified with the "Danaans" of Homer (v. Il. 2, 487).

[3] Cf. "The Mycenaean Age," by Dr. Chr. Tsountas (1897), p. 333.

neighbor tribe; while the products of distant lands were brought to them by the Phœnicians. Later on, when "Mycenæan" art developed, the store of gold and treasure which they possessed required exchangeable values which their soil alone could not produce. Commerce in slaves, or piracy, must have been reckoned among their resources, and they found a ready market among the Phœnicians.

"Later than the Danaans, the Achæns came down into the Peloponnesus, and by their superior vigor and prowess prevailed over the older stock. . . . About 1500 B. C. the Achæans had made themselves masters of Mycenæ, and imposed upon it their own Kings. We have no tradition of any struggle in connection with this dynastic revolution, and it appears probable that the Achæans did not expel the older stock."[4] They planted colonies in Rhodes, Caria, Celecia, founded cities in Cyprus, and in Egypt there is evidence of actual settlements. From the "Mycenæan" treasures we know they must have obtained in abundance the copper of Cyprus, the gold of Asia Minor, the ivory of Africa, even the amber of the Baltic. Probably the Achæans were chiefly engaged in the coasting trade of the Ægæn, and foreign products were brought to them by the Phœnicians[5] (Ezekiel xxvii., 3).

The connection between the Ægæan isles and Egypt[6] is shown by Phœnician, Cyprite and Ægæan pottery discovered at Kahun by Professor Petrie dating from 1100 B. C., and "Mycenæan" vases at Gurob, of dates ranging from 1400-1100 B. C. Again, at Mycenæ and Ialysos in Rhodes, Egyptian vases were found inscribed with the name of Amen-hotep III., of the fourteenth century B. C. This traffic was originally in the hands of the Phœnicians, but the Achæans, who now became masters of the Ægæan, in course of time obtained control also of the traffic with Egypt.

II.

Such were the beginnings of Greek commerce, and of Greek colonization, which played such a large part in their history after-

[4] "The Mycenaean Age" (Tsountas), pp. 343, 345. "Achaeans" and "Danaans" are the ethnic names for the Greeks in Homer, and in Homeric times they occupied the chief sites of the "Mycenaean" culture. Greece is called "the land of Achaea" (Il. 1, 254).

[5] "On the tomb-frescoes of Thebes (Egypt) we see pictured in four groups the tributaries of Tahutmes III. bringing their gifts to that great conquerer; among them . . . are 'the princes of the land of Keftu (Phoenicia) and of the islands in the great sea.' And the tribute in their hands includes vases of distinct Mycenaean style." Tsountas, ibid, p. 319.

[6] This connection appears in the Homeric poems, which treat of Achaean times. In their whole horizon there is but one great foreign monarchy, Egypt, and its capital, Thebes, is cited as the highest type of wealth and warlike power.

wards. The Phœnicians, as we saw, had obtained a new "sphere of influence" in the western Mediterranean. Strabo (I., 48) dates their settlements beyond the Pillars of Hercules soon after the Trojan war, in the time, that is, of Tyre's first expansion. Pliny (N. H. 3, 3) said of Spain: "Nearly all Spain is rich in metals, lead, iron, copper, silver, gold; Eastern Spain in mica-stone, Andalusia in cinnabar. There are also marble quarries." From Tartessus, beyond the straits, they obtained tin, oil, wine and cheese; the wool of the sheep from its fineness was the best for tapestry and weaving, for which arts the Phœnicians were famous. These seas teemed with the tunny and sardine. From Gadir to Tyre communication soon became as frequent and regular as between Tyre and Cyprus. They dotted their routes with factories, which served as ports of call for their ships and warehouses for their merchandise.

The opposite coast of Africa furnished precious wares in abundance—ivory, rare woods, spices and precious metals—which the Tyrian craftsmen wrought into beautiful works of art or bartered to the "Mycenæan" artists of the Ægæan. Utica was founded about 1158 B. C., and near it rose the towns of Hippo, Hadrumetum and Leptis. The district Emporia, on the Lesser Syrtis, was named from its many Phœnician trading towns. The semitic populations were thickly scattered over all this region, but we cannot distinguish generally Phœnician colonies, Carthaginian foundations and native (Libyan) settlements, that had become Punic. Ophelas (Strabo xvii., 826) may exaggerate when he speaks of 300 cities on the Mauretanian coast beyond Gibraltar, but the colonists and the Carthaginians after them stamped West Africa with a thoroughly Phœnician character, and their language was dominant, at least in the cities, far beyond the limits of their nationality, just as was the case with Latin and Arabic in later times. Soon the Phœnicians ventured yet further on the ocean and obtained tin from the mines of Northwest Spain or the richer deposits of Cornwall and the Scilly Isles (Cassiterides). Probably they first visited Britain about 1100 B. C., when Tyre became the chief city of Phœnicia. The most flourishing period of Tyrian commerce may be placed between the reign of Hiram (1028 B. C.) and the internal troubles which resulted in the rebuilding of Carthage (814 B. C.), during which era the fortunes of Tyre were closely connected with those of the kingdom of Judah and Israel. But partly perhaps from the best of national character and partly from their circumstances, the Phœnician cities never attained to political greatness. There never was a common bond which brought the different cities under one rule; and even common dangers did not induce them to do more than conform to a very loose confederation. But the enterprise of their navigators

had built up for them and their great offshoot, Carthage, a sea power which gave them the command of the Mediterranean west of Italy and Sicily. Their wealth, however, had roused the cupidity of Eastern nations. When they became supreme on land Assyria, Egypt, Babylon and Persia tried in turn to get possession of Phœnicia's maritime resources. In 866 B. C. Asshur-nazirpal, King of Assyria, crossed the Euphrates and overran Syria as far as Damascus and Lebanon. The Phœnicians prudently yielded to him and bought off his opposition with costly gifts, so this conquest was merely a nominal one. In 814 B. C. Carthage was rebuilt in Zeugitania by the Syrians, but soon eclipsed the other Punic cities of Africa and engaged in a rivalry of interests with the mother country.[7]

On the death of the Assyrian, Tiglath-pileser, 727 B. C., the whole of Syria again rose in rebellion against his successor, Shalmanasar IV., who hastily crossed the Euphrates to quell it. A revolt of Cyprus against Tyre gave him an easy victory over the Phœnicians, and the Israelites under Hosea were compelled to sue for peace. But Phœnicia's maritime power was now waning. The Phœnician settlers in Sicily, driven back by Greek colonists into Ziz (Panormus), all those on the Spanish and African coasts, continually harassed by the barbarians, all the peoples and settlements, which Tyre, occupied by her struggles against Assyria, could no longer defend, put themselves under the protection of Carthage. The old ethnic name of Pœni, first used on the shores of the Persian Gulf, now resounded over the Mediterranean and Atlantic Ocean, and the Punic empire replaced in the west that of the Phœnician. Towards the end of Asshu-banipal's reign (665 B. C.) Phœnicia had no longer any colony which recognized her authority. Her wealth and commerce were not thereby lessened. She was still the commercial agent of the whole world, for Greece and Carthage, no less than for the craftsmen of Egypt and Assyria. But she had no longer any power left to resist Assyrian aggression. It was only the civil war between Asshur-banipal and his brother in 650 B. C. that enabled Phœnicia to remain independent without a contest.

In 589 Nebu-chadnezzar, after the capture of Jerusalem (Jerem. xxxix.) beseiged Tyre, which capitulated at length after thirteen years on favorable terms. Fifty years later Phœnicia came under the rule of the Persians, and through the energy of Hanno the Great, Carthage asserted her independence. Though the Phœnicians were favored subjects of the Persians because of their indis-

[7] Carthage was founded before 1200 B. C. (Movers, II., pt. 2, p. 137), but had fallen into decay.

pensable fleet, they retained but a shadow of their former greatness. In 332 B. C. Alexander the Great, who had overthrown the Persian Empire, blockaded Tyre by land and sea and captured it after a seven months' seige. The founding of Alexandria, on the Nile, changed the lines of trade and dealt a fatal blow to Phœnician commerce, which now passed into the hands of the Carthaginians and the commercial cities of Greece—Corinth, Argos, Athens. Thus the doom foretold long ago about Tyre by the prophets was fulfilled: "I will make thee like a naked rock; thou shalt be a drying place for nets."[8] Two small fishing villages, Tsûr and Saida, alone remain to mark the sites of the ancient cities of Tyre and Sidon, once "the mart of the nations," which glorying beyond measure in "the multitude of their merchandise," fondly deemed themselves "full of wisdom and perfect in beauty," and had thought to reign among the stars of heaven.

III.

But the Phœnicians were not merely traders who bartered one product for another. From a very early date the towns of the Phœnician coast were active in various manufactures. Glasswork, for which the sands of Belus gave excellent material, had its chief seat in Sidon. Opaque glass was discovered long ago by the Egyptians. Glass blowing is represented on the tombs of Beni Hassan, and glass vases are depicted on the tombs of the pyramids (4000 B. C.). The Phœnicians, substituting a mineral for a vegetable alkali, obtained transparent glass.[9] The natrum (subcarbonate of soda) used for making it was an Egyption product. They made glass of three sorts, (1) a transparent glass, (2) a translucent, colored glass, and (3) an opaque glass, like porcelain. The glass was colored by metallic oxides; blue glass from cobalt, green from copper, brown from manganese, milky white from oxide of tin or phosphate of chalk. It was used for beads and imitations of gems. They cut, ground and engraved glass, and even had the art of introducing gold between two surfaces of the substance.

The twenty-seventh chapter of Ezekiel gives an eloquent description of the riches and vast commerce of the Phœnicians. They were famous for the excellence of their textile fabrics. They obtained wool from the flocks of Sicharia, which were reared by the Nabatæan Arabs. From Egypt they received fine linen—the *byssus* for which Egypt was always famous. Pelusium (near the modern

[8] Ezek. xxvi., 14. Isaias xxiii. Zach. ix., 4. Movers, II., 3, p. 200.

[9] The ancients (as, Pliny N. H. 36, 190) wrongly attributed to the Phoenicians the first discovery of glass.

Suez) was the chief seat of its manufacture, and from a corruption of this name is derived the English word "blouse." Raw silk was obtained from the Persian merchants, which was even then bought from China.

The linen and woolen cloths were dyed with the "Tyrian purple," the produce of the famous *murex*. Their richly colored fabrics are often alluded to by Greek and Latin poets,[10] and Ezekiel mentions "the purple of the isles of Elisa (Hellas)" (vv. 7, 16). The Phœnicians used two species of the *murex*, viz., the *brandaris* and *trunculus*, and also the *purpura lapillus*, to obtain their brilliant dyes. The best Tyrian cloths were termed *dibapha*, and for the production of the true Tyrian purple it was necessary that the dye obtained from the *p. lapillus* should be used after that from the *murex* had been applied. The Murex alone gave a dye that was firm and reckoned moderately good; but the Purpura alone was weak and easily washed out.

The actual tints produced from the shell-fish appeared to have ranged from blue, through violet and purple, to crimson and rose.[11] Scarlet could not be obtained except from the cochineal insect. Even for the brighter sorts of crimson some admixture of the cochineal dye was necessary. The violet tint was not generally prized, except in the time of Augustus; redder hues were commonly preferred. A deep crimson was also in request, and seems frequently to be intended when the term "purple" is used. Purple was used from very early times, and purple and blue are mentioned in Exodus (xxv., 4). Blue was the hyacinthos of the Greeks, being extracted from indigo, which was an Egyptian and a Persian dye.

As regards their ceramic art, it is difficult at present to distinguish between objects of Phœnician and "Mycenæan" art. The finest Phœnician efforts that we can be certain about resemble either the best Egyptian or the best Greek pottery, such as the clay *amphora* found at Curium. It was probably a very inferior kind of pottery that they in early times exported both inside and outside the Mediterranean—to the Cassiterides (Strabo 3, 5) and the island of Cerné (Arguin), on the west African coast (Periplus, par. 112).

The Phœnicians used bronze and copper to manufacture vessels, arms and other implements. They worked in lead, imported from Spain, and iron to a small extent, chiefly for arms. The sword

[10] Ovid, Aeschylus (Suppl. 279-84), Lucan (Pharsalia, 10, 142). Odyss. 15, 417. Iliad 6, 295, etc.

[11] The names of the chief tints—dark-red, argaman, and dark-blue, tekheleth—seem to indicate that this art originated in Babylonia. Among the Jews of Our Lord's time to be clothed "in purple and fine linen" was the sign of greatwealth (Luke xvi., 19).

which Alexander received from the King of Citium, as Plutarch tells us, was doubtless of this metal. Cyprus furnished the iron breast-plates worn by Demetrius Poliorcetes, and in pre-Homeric times it was a Phœnician, Kinyeas, who gave to Agamemnon his breast-plate of steel, gold and tin (Iliad xi., 19). That more remains of iron arms and implements have not been found on Phœnician sites is probably owing to the rapid oxydization of iron, which consequently decays and disappears.[12] Hiram, King of Tyre (B. C. 1028), was "skilful to work in gold, and silver, and bronze, and iron (II. Paral. ii., 14). Cunningly wrought vases and goblets of silver and gold from Zahi are frequently mentioned among the tribute brought to Tahutmes III. and in Homer.[13] The Phœnicians also wrought collars, bracelets and other ornaments of lazuli, green-felspar and other precious stones, and made beautiful chairs and tables of cedar, *Kharub* and *meru* wood, inlaid with ivory, silver and other precious stones and metals. "Here was luxury far beyond that of the Egyptians and technical work which could teach them, rather than be taught. The Syrians were their equals, if not their superiors, in taste and skill."

IV.

Egyptian pottery of the predynastic period shows that ship-building was known in the sixth millenium before Christ, and perhaps was known to the Phœnicians when living on the Persian Gulf, before they migrated to their new homes on the shores of the Mediterranean.

Ezekiel describes for us the construction of their ships (xxvii.): "O Tyrus, . . . They have made all thy shipboards of fir trees of Sanir;[14] they have taken cedars of Lebanon to make masts for thee. Of the oaks of Bashan have they made thine oars; the company of the Ashurites have made thy benches of ivory, brought out of the isles of Chittim."[15]

"Fine linen with broidered work from Egypt was that which thou spreadest forth to be thy sail; blue and purple from isle of Elishah[16] was that which covered thee.

---

[12] "Iron, which occurs rarely and for ornaments, in some of the tombs at Enkomi (Cyprus) suddenly superseded bronze for weapons, and its introduction was accompanied, as in the Argaean, by economic, and probably political, changes, which broke up the high civilization of the Mycenaean colonies (about 1100 B. C.) and brought about a return to poverty, isolation and comparative barbarism" (Encycl. Brit.). This change was probably due to the "Dorian invasion."

[13] Cf. Fl. Petrie, "Hist. of Egypt," II. Iliad xxiii., 741. Ezek. xxviii., 13.

[14] The name which the Emorites gave to Mt. Hermon.

[15] The Aegaean isles, especially Cyprus, where the name appears in Kition, a town on the east coast.

[16] Generally referred to the shores of Hellas, especially the Peloponnesus.

"The inhabitants of Sidon and Arvad were thy mariners; thy wise men, O Tyrus, that were in thee were thy pilots.

"The ancients of Gebel and the wise men thereof were in thee thy calkers;[17] all the ships of the sea with their mariners were in thee to occupy thy merchandize."

When the Pharoahs of the eighteenth dynasty kept a war fleet in the Mediterranean the ships were manned by Phœnician sailors. Even in later times Greek observers noted with admiration the exact order kept on board Phœnician ships, the skill with which every corner of space was utilized, the careful disposition of the cargo, the vigilance of the steersmen and their mates (Xenophon, Oecon. viii., 11). The earliest known representation of a Phœnician ship occurs in the sculptures of Sargon. All their vessels, from the common round *gaulos* to the great "Tarshish ships"—the "Atlantic liners" of the ancient world—had a speed which the Greeks never rivalled.[18] Scylax (par. 112) tells us that merchant ships usually had small life-boats attached to them. Before the end of the sixth century B. C. biremes had been superseded by triremes, *i. e.*, vessels with three tiers of oars.[19] At the prow of the vessels (or at the poop, according to Suidas) stood little figures of a god, probably intended to protect the ships from harm.[20] By some they are thought to be statues of the Egyptian dwarf God, Ptah, to whom there was erected a large temple in the city of Memphis.[21] It is interesting to notice that the men employed in building it were the Fenkhu (Phœnicians), who in a later age built Solomon's temple at Jerusalem.

V.

Besides commerce by sea with Egypt, the Ægean, Africa, Hellas and Spain, the Phœnicians carried on an extensive land trade by means of caravans. As early as the time of Joseph (about 1600 B. C.) we find a "company" of the Midianites on their way from Gilhead with their camels bearing spices, balm and myrrh to Egypt (Gen. xxxvii., 28). In Isaias (xxi., 13) there is mention of "traveling companies of Dedanim," "the multitude of camels, the drome-

[17] In the time of Solomon the men of Gebel were famous as shipbuilders and seam-calkers (III. Kings 5, 18).

[18] The fleet of Xerxes, which sailed from Asia in 481 B. C. to invade Greece, included contingents from Phoenicia, Cyprus, Ionia, Lycia, etc., but the Phoenician sailors were deemed the best (Hdt. vii., 44).

[19] Hdt. iii., 13. Xenophon, Oeconom, par. 8.

[20] Hdt. iii., 37. Cf. Bochart, Phaleg. II., 3; Movers, Phönizier, I., p. 383.

[21] Memphis was also called Haîkûptah, "abode of the spirit of Ptah," from which some say the Greek name for Egypt, Aiguptos, is derived. The Egyptians themselves called their country Gêmi, "the black land" (Cham, in Scripture).

daries of Midian and Epha, and men from Saba bringing gold and incense" (Is. lx., 6). Maspéro tells us: "It is not likely that the Phœnician traders went themselves to seek the gold of the Altaï Mountains and the wares of the Ganges; they only brought merchandise from intermediate depôts in Arabia and Chaldæa. At least they had advanced as far as possible on the great inland highways and occupied important posts at fords of rivers and mountain passes. Laïsh, at the source of the Jordan, was a Sidonian colony (Jos. xiii., 6; Judges xviii., 7, 8). Hamath, in the valley of the Orontes, Thapsacus at a ford of the Euphrates, Nisibis near the source of the Tigris were of Phœnician origin. These towns and others not recorded in history were so many depôts where they stored the products of the surrounding country, to be brought in due course to their warehouses at Lebanon."[22]

There were two main inland routes from Phœnicia to the east, (1) The first ran to Haran[23] (Ezek. xxvii., 23), whence it branched off northwards to the Chalybes, on the Euxine coast, and eastwards to Carchemish, on the Euphrates, then across Mesopotamia to the Tigris, and so by Nineveh to Babylon and the Persian Gulf. (2) The second led to Laish, whence it branched off through Midian and along the west coast of Arabia to Yumen, and southwards ran through the gorges of Carmel, past Gaza and Ascalon to Mount Sinai and the Egyptian delta.

The corn imported into Phœnicia was produced in the rich Ammonite country. Ivory and ebony came from India to the Persian Gulf and was conveyed by the Dedanites into Palestine and Phœnicia. Thogorma, a district of Armenia, sent thither horses and mules.[24]

From the Ægean shores (Hebr. *Javan*, Ionia) and the Euxine (Tubal and Moshoch, Gen. x., 2) came slaves[25] and bronze implements. From the Jews and Israelites the Phœnicians seem to have got almost all the grain which they needed for their sustenance. The intercourse of Israel with Phœnicia continued to be carried on at all times, and led to the introduction of Baal worship among the Jews (III. Kings, 16). Wheat, honey, oil and balm were exported by the Phœnicians,[26] timber, fish and other wares being received in return. Western Palestine was notoriously a land not only of corn, but also of wine, olive oil and honey, and could readily impart of its superfluity to its neighbor in time of need.

---

22 Histoire Ancienne, p. 235.

23 In cuneiform, Charan.

24 Strabo xi., 14, 9. Herodot. i., 194.

25 Hdt. i., 1. Odyss. xv., 415-484.

26 III. Kings v., 6, 9, 11. Acts xii., 20. Ezra iii., 7. Nehem. xiii., 16. Ezek. xxvii., 17. In the time of Ezekiel it was "wheat of Minnith."

The oaks of Bashan were very abundant and seem to have been preferred by the Phœnicians to their own oaks as the material of oars. Balm came from Gilhead (Gen. xxxvii., 28), but balm of a better quality seems to have been imported from the lower Jordan valley (Strabo xvi., 2, par. 41). From the Damascene Syrians they imported "wine of Helbon (Strabo xvi., 3, par. 22) and white wool; from this Syrian wool, mixed perhaps with some coarser sort, seems to have been woven "damask," mentioned in Amos (iii., 12).

Their commerce with Egypt was both ancient and very extensive. They had settled at Memphis (perhaps about 4000 B. C.), and Phœnician trade soon took firm root there. From Egypt they imported "fine linen," natron for glass, papyrus, earthenware, scarabs, statuettes and in later times sarcophagi. They exported thither wine on a large scale, tin and purple garment (Pliny, N. H.' xii., 39, 40).

"With Arabia," says Rawlinson, "Phœnician trade was of special importance, since not only did the great peninsula itself produce many of the most valuable articles of commerce, but it was also mainly, if not solely, through Arabia that the Indian market was thrown open to Phœnician trades."[27]

The Sabæans brought the wares and spices of India and East Africa by sea to Yemen, whence they were taken by caravans to Haran, and there delivered to Phœnician merchants or exchanged for the costly fabrics of Chaldæa and Babylon (Pliny, N. H. xii., 39, 40). Thus Haran was a sort of exchange, or mart, for the merchants of Phœnicia, Arabia and Babylonia. The medium of exchange was originally in kind—corn and oxen being bartered for provisions, liquids, etc., and later the precious metals. Their money was in the shape of a metallic currency by weight. In ancient Babylonia, as in Egypt, the precious metals, especially silver, circulated as uncoined ingots.[28] The Phœnician unit of value, the shekel, weighed nearly half an ounce (230 grains). The first mention of a business contract in Scripture occurs in Genesis xxiii., 16, when Abraham bought the field from Ephron the Hittite, and "weighed to him the silver which he had named in the audience of the sons of Heth, four hundred shekels of silver, current money with the merchant."

Both Assyria and Babylonia supplied the Phœnicians with fabrics

[27] Cf. Hdt. iii., 107. Sheba in Yemen was the emporium of Arabian trade, consisting chiefly of gold, gems, ivory, ebony and wrought iron.

[28] The Assyrians had both ring and ingot money, silver forming the standard value of all purchaseable objects. The Egyptians used ingots for convenience, threaded on wire; also twists of copper wire, called S. Tabnu, and rings of gold. The Lydians were probably the first nation that used gold and silver coins, which were of an ovoid, slightly flattened shape, about 700 B. C. (Hdt. 1., 94).

of extraordinary value, rich in a peculiar embroidery and deemed so precious that they were packed in cedar chests, which the Phœnicians must have brought with them from Lebanon (Ezek. xxvii., 23, 24). The wares of Assyria were sometimes exported to Greece (Hdt. i., 1). From this country came the cylinders in rock crystal, jasper, hematite and steatite, chiefly for Phœnician colorists in Cyprus and Crete. "Babylonia," says Sayce,[29] "was preëminently an industrial and commercial state, carrying on commerce with all parts of the known world, and there was therefore a highly elaborate commercial code of law. As might have beeen expected in a commercial community, no stigma attached to trade. All members of the state took part in it, and we find even the crown prince Belshazzar acting through his agent as a wool merchant."

In the time of Solomon (1000 B. C.) Hiram, King of Tyre, sent cedar wood and precious metals, together with Tyrian workmen, for the Temple at Jerusalem. Among the various works in bronze executed by them were palm trees, lilies, lions, oxen and cherubim, the favorite subjects of such Phœnician works of art as have come down to us (III. Kings vii., 13). Doors of cedar overlaid with gold afforded entrance, and before these hung veils of blue, purple and scarlet of the brightest and softest linen, wrought with curious flowers.

When the foundation stones were dug up in recent years they bore the marks of the Phœnician masons painted in red.

After the fall of Tyre the Jews, kinsmen of the Phœnicians, were greatly favored both by Alexander and his successors, especially at Antioch and Alexandria, which now became the chief emporia of the East. At Alexandria they were placed on a level with the Greeks, above the native Egyptians. But it was not till they were scattered by foreign invasions and by the destruction of Jerusalem (70 A. D.) that they began to develop those commercial qualities for which they have since been so famous.

VI.

It only remains to sketch briefly to their close the fortunes of Carthage. After her restoration in 814 B. C. she had rapidly increased in wealth and power, and gradually acquired the Phœnician trade in the western Mediterranean. Like all Phœnician colonies, Carthage had an admirable situation; there were two good natural harbors, and the town was strongly fortified, while the fertile plain

[29] Encycl. Brit. (art. "Babylonia"). The "code of Hammurabi" (2285 B. C.) formed the basis of Assyrian and Babylonian law for nearly two thousand years.

[30] *Harper's Magazine*, 1904.

in which she stood was well suited for tillage, and she could export large quantities of corn to neighboring cities.

Carthage was the one Phœnician colony which seems to have cherished political ambitions. She commenced a career of conquest in Africa and obtained tribute and levies in war from the Libyans and other tribes. Vergil (Aen. I.) speaks of her as—"Carthago, . . . dives opum, studiisque asperrima belli." She carefully restrained the other Punic cities on the African coast, such as Utica, from ever becoming her rivals. Like the Phœnicians, the Carthaginians endeavored to keep a monopoly of commerce and drive all rivals out of the field. Thus, according to one of their treaties, the Romans were excluded from trading with Sardinia and Libya, and when the Greeks colonized Marseilles and islands off the north of Spain they were prevented from trading with the Spanish mainland. The feud between Greek and Phœnician began when the latter were ousted from the Ægean Sea, 1327 B. C.

In the fifth century B. C. the Semitic portion of the East twice assailed Greece in Sicily under the leadership of Carthage. The Greek colonies there held their own, but did not drive out the invaders. It was reserved for another power to do this and drive the Semite out of Europe.

The Greek antagonism to the Phœnicians was continued by the Romans towards the Carthaginians, and a collision between these two great and growing powers was inevitable. The character and aims of Aryan and Semite were as mutually incompatible as light and darkness. In the course of time one or other must perish.

The first Punic war in which Rome engaged was for Sicily, and Rome won it, expelling the Syrian colonists from the island. In revenge Hannibal conquered Spain in 218 B. C. and crossed the Alps into Italy. But by 205 B. C. the Romans had reconquered Spain, crossed over to Africa and made that a Roman province. The value of the trade of Carthage and the natural advantages of her position are most easily seen in the interval between the second and third Punic war. Even when her political power was broken, she advanced so rapidly in wealth that the Romans feared she would rally her forces, and therefore wisely acted on Cato's repeated warning: "Delenda est Carthago." She was taken at length and destroyed in 146 B. C. How desperate was the struggle, how firmly the Phœnician colonists had planted themselves in the west may be seen from the fact that seven hundred years after the fall of Carthage men still talked Punic, or Phœnician, in North Africa. The Bible itself (St. Augustine tells us) was translated into that language, and this only died out before its kindred dialect of Arabic in the eighth century of our era.

So Tyre and Sidon had their day and became at length "a naked rock, a drying place for nets," but the memory of what they achieved will live forever. Were it only for the invention of the alphabet they claim a place among the greatest benefactors of mankind. While unable altogether to agree with the statement of a recent writer that the alphabet "is perhaps, without exception, the most stupendous achievement of the human intellect within historical times. . . . It made possible for the first time that education of the masses upon which all later progress of civilization was so largely to depend,"[30] we may perhaps accept Professor McCurdy's more sober estimate that "it has become the main working instrument of the world's civilization." Newman has said that "Attica has formed the human intellect," yet this she could never have done if the means had not been afforded her by the practical Phœnician trader, whose alphabet superseded the complicated writing systems of Egypt and Babylon and the "Mycenæan" syllabaries. Both the hieroglyphic writings and the cuneiform consisted of several hundred symbols and combinations, whereas the Phœnician alphabet contained but twenty-two.

Moreover, they carried civilization round the Mediterranean shores. The first seats of commerce were also the first seats of civilization. Exchange of merchandise led to an exchange of ideas, and the peoples of the "Great Sea," as the Hebrews called it, first became acquainted with Egyptian and Babylonian science and art through the Phœnicians. In a later age Greek art and letters, which they had done so much to form, spread down the old Phœnician lines of communication and became the great civilizing influence in the Roman Empire, till in the first century of the Christian era Greek (the "common dialect") was the chief language spoken round the Mediterranean, being also the language used by the writers of the New Testament. Thus, though the Phœnicians were engaged in seeking wealth for its own sake, and had no worthy notion of using it, they were unconsciously preparing the minds of the Mediterranean peoples for that higher civilization, Christianity, and paving the way for the spread of the Gospel. They were thus most wonderfully raised up, as for other reasons, so especially to be ministers to a Divine Revelation, of which personally they knew nothing.

"Civilization," as Newman[31] says, "is the systematic use, improvement and combination of those faculties which are man's characteristic; and, viewed in its idea, it is the perfection, the happiness of our mortal state. It is the development of art out of nature and of self-government out of passion, and of certainty out of

[31] Historical Sketches (The Turks, lect. 4).

opinion, and of faith out of reason. Supernatural truth is its sovereign law. Such is it in its true idea, synonymous with Christianity; and, not only in idea, but in matter of fact also, *is* Christianity ever civilization, as far as its influence prevails; but, unhappily, in matter of fact, civilization is not necessarily Christianity."

Still the civilization which the Phœnicians spread around the shores of the "Great Sea" did not begin and end with itself; it heralded and prepared the way for Christianity, just as the dim light of the dawn foretells the brightness of the perfect day. Perhaps Isaias (xxiii., 18) had in mind this, their civilizing mission, when he prophesied of Tyre: "Her merchandise and her hire shall be sanctified to the Lord; her merchandise shall be for them that shall dwell before the Lord." At all events, this work of preparation, fraught with such far-reaching issues, forms not the least of their claims to the lasting and grateful remembrance of mankind.

J. D. Murphy, S. J.

St. Beuno's College, North Wales.

THE EDUCATIONAL FACT.

LAST April I proposed to the readers of this Quarterly a scholastic question and outlined the principles on which the question should, in my judgment, be answered. I asked: In what has our school system profited by the superabundant literature published during the last century on the subject of education? What impress has the pedagogical activity which inspired that literature, or has been inspired by it, left upon our school laws? Our national interest in so important a subject, if intelligently directed, ought surely to have borne some fruit worthy of us and profitable to the common weal. We ought by this time to have a clearer, more comprehensive and widespread appreciation of what we are aiming at and of the methods to be used for the realization of our purpose. Our patriotic zeal in the cause of education ought above all to have resulted in the establishment of a school system growing from year to year more efficient in its application of suitable means to a well-defined end. Has it borne this fruit?

We have undoubtedly multiplied schools so as to put the acquisition of an elementary education within the reach of practically every child in the land, and to make the attainment of secondary, and even higher education, a matter of comparatively little difficulty. Estimated in money, the value we attach to our school

policy may be inferred from the fact that our annual expenditure for elementary education alone is over two hundred and fifty million dollars; that within a period of ten years it has increased fifty per cent., although within the same period the pupils of our common schools have increased only about twenty-three per cent.[1] Add to this the sums of money that are annually expended in the conduct and management of high and normal schools, of manual and industrial schools, of State colleges and universities, and we shall have a total yearly outlay for education that indicates no niggardly spirit in the use of public revenues. Schools we have, and we are paying liberally for them; nor need this disturb us, if they serve efficiently a civic purpose.

But how are we to measure their efficiency? Is it merely by the fact that the percentage of those who cannot read or write is progressively vanishing, or that the per capita wealth of the nation is steadily increasing? It may be conceded that it is one of the functions of government to promote national prosperity, and that in the economic conditions of our modern life an elementary education is necessary for every citizen, if he is to get his share of the general affluence. Nor will it be denied that under our form of government an elementary education is a desirable qualification for all citizens who are to exercise the right of suffrage. But desirable as it may be that every voter should be able to read his ballot and the campaign literature with which his party supplies him prior to his casting it, this of itself is no indication that he will not sell his vote to the highest bidder or be guided in his use of it by principles neither of patriotism nor of morality. And necessary as are the intelligence and industry that produce wealth, it is of more importance that no citizen use his intelligence and industry to become actual possessor of that portion of the general wealth which in justice or equity belongs to another. That only six per cent. of our white population of ten years and over is illiterate, and that

[1] In 1890 the number of pupils enrolled in the common schools of the country was 12,722,581; in 1900, 15,503,110. In 1890 the annual expenditure for school purposes was $140,506,715, and in 1900, $214,964,618. It is noticeable that only a very small part of this increase in expenses is due to an increase in salaries of teachers. In 1893—the earliest date of which I could find a record—the average yearly salary of male teachers was $447.60, and of female teachers $374.80. These increased respectively in 1903 to $499.80 and $405.10; that is to say, the increase in ten years was about eleven per cent. for men and less than nine per cent. for women. Yet during the same period the increase in the expenditure for combined salaries of superintendents and teachers has increased nearly fifty per cent. In this connection an observation of the United States Commissioner of Education is significant. "Twenty-two years ago," he says, "the percentage of male teachers was nearly forty-three, while the last year (1901-1902) it had fallen below twenty-eight."

everybody in the country is in the eyes of the statistician of averages worth nearly twice as much as he was thirty or forty years ago is comforting; but not so comforting as it would be if we were sure that a very large majority of the other ninety-four per cent., in whom education has awakened the impulse and developed the faculty of acquiring material prosperity, were not governed by a mad desire to possess riches without serious thought of the morality of their methods, except in so far as they impinge on legality or business conventions. One need not be a reactionary, obscurantist or other disreputable thing in order to doubt the value of education if the masses on whom it is conferred have been rendered capable merely of enjoying by personal perusal the daily anthology of wars and crimes, of sports and gambling, of fashion and finance, of industrial and political rivalries which their newspapers purvey; or if their highest intellectual activity consists in hastily imbibing once a day the editorial wisdom of some midnight scribe, or in following the plot of the latest popular novel, especially of such as bring the violation of God's commandments, the craft of successful commercial, financial or political knavery and the odor of the divorce courts under the roof of every home.

Mental education and material progress that may result therefrom do not constitute the adequate goal of attainment which we have set for our educational policy. It does not fully realize its aim merely by fitting the young to be expert agents in the promotion of prosperity. Our loyalty and resources were put into requisition for the establishment and support of our public schools, our interest and patriotism enlisted in their preservation and defense, on the distinct ground that they were to be seminaries of citizenship; that their foremost purpose was, and their crowning effect would be the formation of the youth of this nation to a manhood that would safeguard, elevate and enlarge American civilization. In the Constitution of nearly all our States it is expressly ordained that it shall be the duty of the Legislature to establish an efficient system of public schools, because through their instrumentality good government and the stability of our republican institutions will be secured. Many declare that a general diffusion of education is "essential to the preservation of the rights and liberties of the people." There is no State that does not by its fundamental laws make education a function of government and instruct its Legislature to provide for its universal communication. One of them goes so far as to declare that the establishment of schools is a function of government superior to and supremely controlling all others. The jurists who drafted the Constitution which the people of Florida ratified in 1868 put the following section into the article on educa-

tion: "It is the *paramount duty*[2] of the State to make ample provision for the education of all children residing within its borders." This unanimity regarding the necessity of education, and the constitutional duty imposed by the people of every State on their Legislatures respecting it, can have only one rational explanation. They were profoundly convinced of its importance for the essential well-being of the State and of its value as an agency in the formation of good citizens. It was to prepare heirs of their political fortune who should be worthy of it and capable of transmitting it unimpaired to future generations that in the fundamental compact, defining the form and structure of the State, they bound their Legislatures to provide schools and the means of education.

Citizenship, I showed in my last article, calls for a group of virtues that are not acquired by a merely intellectual or scientific education. A good citizen is more than a man of knowledge and developed mind; he is a man of character—a man of personal integrity, of social worth and responsibility, and of civic honor unselfishness and zeal. In his private life purity and tenderness, love of his own hearth and devotion to its interests make his daily home-coming a joy and a grace to his family. His relations with his fellow-men are characterized by an habitual sense of justice and sincerity and of toleration and kindliness. His patriotism is a synthesis of chivalrous ardor and business-like prudence. He practises those principles of social righteousness which the Constitution of Massachusetts declares it shall be the duty of legislatures and magistrates in all future periods of that Commonwealth to countenance and inculcate—"the principles of humanity and general benevolence, public and private charity, industry and frugality, honesty and punctuality in their dealings, sincerity and good humor and all social affections and generous sentiments among the people." This ideal of citizenship may be unattainable; an ideal generally is in this world. Like Kantian holiness, though the bourn of our efforts and pursuit, it can be realized only in an indefinite series of continual approximations to an end that can never be reached. Or perhaps better, it is, like a mathematical limit, a term of perfection to which we should ever tend, which we may never reach, but to which we can approach nearer than any assignable imperfection. It is the asymptote of life's path, always beyond contact, but ever determining the line along which we must move until union is effected in infinity. That an ideal is unattainable, however, is no reason why we should not pursue it, if the pursuit itself is necessary to keep us in the course of our destiny. Without an ideal to lure us

[2] The italicization in this citation and in others throughout this article are, unless otherwise noted, the present writer's.

upward we sink by degrees into a world where all knowledge comes from sense, and reason measures reality; where materialism is science and rationalism is philosophy; where thought and aspiration range within the confines of experience, and virtue, refinement, and nobility are translated into terms of utilitarianism. An ideal, because it is an ideal, may after our efforts to attain it be a source of discontent and pain to us, demonstrating as it does that there is something always unattained; yet its attestation to us is that which the young Seraph gave to him who stood upon the mountain, musing on the dreams of old and looking for " a mystic city, goal of high emprise:"

> There is no mightier spirit than I to sway
> The heart of man, and teach him to attain
> By shadowing forth the unattainable.

That the best education which we can give will fall short of its purpose and fail to produce at once and in every case the highest and most perfect type of citizenship, is no motive for lowering our standards to a level at which we fancy we may obtain the gratification of successful attainment. Success in such a case would be failure. Nor are the practical difficulties, of whatever kind they may be, arguments for abandoning a principle and holding as a doctrine of perfection, that studies and disciplines, the peculiar and specific character of which consists in their formative effect on character, should be eliminated from our educational system.

I furthermore showed that the qualities which go to make good citizens are not normally and in their germane forms possessed, unless conscience be trained in childhood and youth by the inculcation of morality; and that a vital morality, one namely which is not merely influential enough to appeal to the emotions of childhood or the undeveloped reason of youth, but powerful enough to restrain the ambition, the strength of passion, and the vigor of personality in manhood can be inculcated by the presentation of ideals of conduct and life which religion alone supplies. The only question to answer then is whether the moral and religious training that preserve and invigorate citizenship and civilization are to-day, because of the educational principles which during the last three-quarters of a century we as a people have been reducing to practice, developed wisely and effectively by our system of public schools.

I.

In the first place, then, has the profession and practice of religion grown with the growth of our public schools? Have we become more profoundly convinced of the truths of Christianity and more devout in our allegiance to it? The question so limited may or

may not be fully answered by two contrasted facts, yet they should be kept in mind by those who undertake to give an answer. When the movement to which our present school system is due was started, in 1837, Horace Mann was chosen to direct it. In an educational document which he issued shortly after his appointment to the secretaryship of the Massachusetts State Board of Education he tells us that not one-third of the children of the Commonwealth between the ages of five and fifteen attended school, and of those who did show some appreciation of the value of an elementary education many were satisfied with three or four years of irregular attendance during the year. Over two-thirds of the children, therefore, were growing up illiterates. To-day, less than seventy years after he planted the seed that has since sprung up and ripened to maturity, not one-third of the people of this country profess any religion, and of those who do many attend divine worship as irregularly as the children of Massachusetts in 1840 attended school. More than two-thirds of the American people, therefore, are to-day what may be called religious illiterates. Making due allowance for the errors and defects that exist in census returns or computations, conceding even that many who profess no definite form of belief acknowledge vaguely the existence of a Supreme Being and a future state of rewards and punishments, and entertain in their hearts some undefined Christian religiosity, the fact remains that illiteracy has uniformly decreased with the extension of the public school system, and that the profession and practice of religion has diminished with an increase of literacy. A curious aftermath this, or at least coincidence of popular education. Its significance lies precisely in this, that our public school system has not fostered religion. Whether they have exerted a positive influence in the disintegration of religious belief is a question I am not now considering. My inquiry regards their failure to promote either directly or indirectly an elevating force that is the leaven of civilization and the marrow of good citizenship. And the fact is that whatever other beneficent results they have produced, they have failed in what is fundamental.

This outgrowth of popular education was not aimed at by Horace Mann and his colleagues. They professed to believe that a purely secular education, one namely from which religion was excluded, would be calamitous for the country. The founder of our public school system is declared by one of his panegyrists to have had "strong convictions on the importance of moral and practical religious instruction and training in the schools," and "a genius for morality and practical religion in their application to common affairs." "No idea was more abhorrent to Horace Mann," he

furthermore says, "than the extreme secular theory of the common schools advocated by an influential body of educators, and to some extent actually enforced during the past thirty years." That the culmination of his labors should be schools from which religion, the basis of morality, is dislodged, and that the people among whom these schools have prospered should have so widely abandoned religion in practice, must cause his disembodied spirit some twinges of distrust as to the wisdom with which he employed his genius while sojourneying in Massachusetts.

Nor did they anticipate such a result. On the contrary, they scented from afar a glorious harvest of goodness and religious virtue from the establishment and expansion of the public school system. They saw in their mind's eye a blessed age, when all the people would say: "Come, let us go up to the mountain of the Lord and to the house of the God of Jacob, and he will teach us his ways, and we will walk in his paths." How profoundly convinced Horace Mann was of the stupendous greatness of his work as an agent of spiritual regeneration is shown by an address which he delivered in 1840, in which he indirectly pays himself the compliment of being the author of the greatest social boon in human history, and rising on the wings of prophecy foretells for posterity the coming of Saturnian days. "The common school," he says, "is the institution which can receive and train up children in the elements of all good knowledge and virtue before they are subjected to the alienating competitions of life. This institution is the greatest discovery ever made by man; we repeat it, *the common school is the greatest discovery ever made by man.*[3] . . . Other social organizations are curative and remedial; this is preventive and an antidote. They come to heal diseases and wounds; this is to make the physical and moral frame invulnerable to them. Let the common school be expanded to its capabilities, let it be worked with the efficiency of which it is susceptible, and nine-tenths of the crimes in the penal code would become obsolete; the long catalogue of human ills would be abridged; man would walk more safely by day; every pillow would be more inviolate by night; property, life and character held by a stronger tenure; all rational hopes regarding the future brightened." All this, of course, is the vaticination of a rhapsodist. On no experience of the past were these predictions and promises of Mann based, nor on any wide and thorough knowledge of human nature; nor on any intellectual grasp of the forces that he was dealing with. The grounds on which was supported this forecast of the future physical social and spiritual blessings that were to flow from his reconstruction of the public school

[3] The italics are Mann's.

system were purely subjective, the dreams of an educational Alnascher, who without perceiving it kicked aside Christianity, the very element of education that might have helped to the verification of his prophecy. Nevertheless they seemed to him to have objective reality; his beliefs and anticipations were evidence beyond the shadow of even an imprudent doubt. Prophecy, it has been said, is a harmless business provided you do not invest in it. But we did invest in it. We took Horace Mann and his fellow-prophets at their own valuation. They made large promises, and we accepted him and his followers as inspired leaders.

The problem of teaching religion in the schools confronted Mann as it is confronting us to-day, though to-day it has grown more many-headed. At the time he was working out his plan of school reform a large number of influential persons in Massachusetts had revolted against New England Calvinism and become Unitarians. Among these was Mann himself, though his biographer tells us that he could have said of himself: "My heart is Unitarian, but my nerves are still Calvinistic." There were therefore practically but two religious denominations in the State, and the problem of so conducting the common schools that the children of both these denominations should be taught religion was practically in the hands of one whose ideals and sympathies were Unitarian, while his energy and intensity of purpose were Calvinistic. To the unsophisticated it looks as if there were only one solution then, as there is only one now, and that is to accommodate the school to the home. Any other solution would make the school, which should be an adjunct and extension of the home, an institution adverse or at least alien to it. But the reformer, "with the heart of a Unitarian and the nerves of a Calvinist," attempted another solution. He could not recognize the previous question: Is the school for the sake of the home or the home for the sake of the school? He cited the law providentially passed by the Legislature of Massachusetts on April 20, 1837, two years before he resigned his position as President of the Senate, in order to begin his career as an educational reformer. This law prohibited the teaching of any denominational religion in the State schools; and Mann himself had a prominent, if not the greatest part, in the drafting and enactment of it. Under conditions, therefore, which were of his own creation his problems became more complex. He was to devise a method by which religion should be taught in the schools without violating the majesty of his law. They were to teach no religion that might be called denominational, and at the same time teach a religion that would satisfy two antagonistic sects: those who professed a belief in supernatural revelation and those who rejected

it; those who held tenaciously to the creed of Calvin, and those who utterly repudiated it; those who, according to Mann's own profession of faith,[4] believed that revealed religion would inevitably vanish before the superior claims of natural religion, as the day-star does before the light of the rising sun, and those who were convinced that such a belief was a reversal to deism and a step backwards towards atheism.

A man of more intellectual honesty would have shrunk from the task of finding a common term for such incommensurables. Not so Horace Mann. His purpose of dealing justly with the problem is indicated by his declaration that it was legal to have books treating of religious subjects in the schools, and that he "deplored the absence of moral and religious instruction in our schools;" but that "school committees had not found books expository of the doctrines of revealed religion, which were not also denominational." In other words, he was willing that religion should be taught provided it was not revealed religion, but his religion. Every exposition of the doctrines of revealed religion was definite, and therefore denominational. If those who professed a revealed religion could come to some agreement with those who hated all revealed religion, and could enunciate their agreement in a body of doctrines which would be vague enough to offend none and so definite as to please all, such an exposition would be recognized as not excluded by

[4] "Natural religion stands as preëminent over revealed religion as the deepest experience over the lightest hearsay. The power of natural religion is scarcely begun to be understood or appreciated. The force and cogency of the evidence, the intensity and irresistibleness of its power are not known, because its elements are not developed and explained. It gives us more than an intellectual conviction—it gives a feeling of truth; and however much the light of revealed religion may have guided the generations of men amid this darkness of mortality, yet *I believe that the time is coming when the light of natural religion will be to that of revealed religion as the rising sun is to the day-star that precedes it.*"—*Mann's Journal*, May 8, 1837. Horace Mann had only one concept of supernatural religion, namely, that imbibed by him in early life, and expressing the malignity of the reformer of Savoy. Calvinism was the only form of Christianity that he really knew. This hideous caricature of the religion of Christ rose up before him whenever he came in presence of the real religion and distorted his vision. Nor was he exceptional in this. Many of the early Unitarians, and many since, have hated Christianity because they have thought of it in terms of Calvinism. The dismal doctrines of Calvin faced them at their birth, hovered over their cradles in infancy, tainted the cheerfulness of their boyhood and youth, soured and misdirected the energies of their manhood, took the sunshine out of their old age and cast its baleful shadows back over their lives and forward into eternity, as on their dying beds they awaited the presence of their maker. The revolt against it took on the form of a revolt against the essential doctrines of Christianity. In rejecting Calvin's horrible distortion of the religion in which mercy and truth have met, and justice and peace have kissed, they swung to the opposite extreme of rejecting also supernatural religion and the Godhead of Christ.

law. It was a clever ruse; first get a law passed implicitly disqualifying your adversary from using the public resources, and then generously offer him his share so far as the law permits. That accepted model of a trickster, a political boss, could not more deftly have led his opponent up into a blind alley and there offered him the right of way. In substance and principle it does not differ from the device said to be adopted sometimes by wicked aldermen when they are about to offer a municipal contract to the lowest bidder, yet wish it to fall to the lot of some loyal and deserving politician. It is said that this is effected by fixing the specifications in such a manner that only he can bid within the requirements of the law, for whose benefit the contract was predestined. In the language of the profession to which aldermen of this variety belong, "it was up to" the Evangelical Congregationalists to find a solution, and only one solution was possible—to acknowledge themselves beaten and to permit their lambs, if they were to make use of the educational pastures which their taxes helped to support, to be fed in the parched meadows of Unitarianism.

Accordingly Mann undertook to reduce the teaching of religion to such a minimum that its positive content could be refused by no denomination. The schools might teach "the principles of piety and morality common to all sects of Christians." In a letter to Mr. Combe—a name of ominous import—he conceded that the Bible might be read in the schools, because without interpretation it would be harmless. The exigencies of his law were respected by inventing a new sect, which may be called the Least Common Denomination. Religion in the schools was saved by banishing every belief that acknowledge the Godhead of Christ and the supernatural character of His message and mission. Thenceforth, until the principle invoked by Mann worked itself out to its logical issue, the public schools were in effect parochial schools of Unitarianism, although they were pharisaically dubbed non-sectarian. The whole procedure was a rather obvious attempt to use the public schools for the purpose of creating a State religion to take the place of the one which Massachusetts by the amendment to its Constitution of 1833 had abolished. There can be little doubt, therefore, that Horace Mann was earnestly in favor of teaching religion in the public schools. Later educators, however, who did not possess the peculiar logical acumen that goes "with the heart of a Unitarian and the nerves of a Calvinist," found this solution of the religious problem unsatisfactory, and excluded from the public schools even the religion of the Least Common Denominator. So the common schools of the country from being frankly denominational became non-sectarian, and an attempt was made to teach a religion which,

because it was no one's religion, was supposed to be acceptable to everybody; and then by the logic of facts developed into our present agnostic schools. This last position is frankly proclaimed as the spirit and law of the American State by a representative Unitarian. "The secular school must be more than non-sectarian," he says; "it must be religiously neutral. Religious freedom means more than the absence of sectarian instruction; it means the absence of all religious exercises and theological teachings."[5]

II.

The trend of opinion by which these changes were brought is clearly recorded in our constitutional history. The Constitutions drafted and adopted by the States, the enactments of Legislatures and the decisions of courts show a gradual but steady tendency towards a concept of the State according to which it becomes the duty of government to ignore religion completely. That the State is not a religious institution, and that the teaching of morality and religion is not a governmental function are truths which no advocate of the teaching of morality and religion in our public schools would deny. The historical definition of the State's purpose as given by Cicero, as found in Roman jurisprudence and embodied in the teaching of the Scholastics, distinctly denies to the State any direct jurisdiction over the spiritual lives of its citizens. Every Catholic theologian and political writer of any standing will admit the secular character of the State in this sense, that its direct interest and immediate scope is purely temporal.[6] But they would not

[5] On the same principle, civil liberty would mean the absence of all instruction in civics, and political liberty would mean the expulsion of all teaching of American history from our schools.

[6] Suarez will, I presume, be taken as a representative exponent of Catholic doctrine on the nature of the State. In his work, De Legibus, he lays down the following propositions:

"Dico ergo *primo:* potestas civilis et jus civile *per se* non respiciunt aeternam felicitatem supernaturalem vitae futurae, tanquam finem proprium, vel proximum vel ultimum. . . . Dico potestatem civilem per *relationem extrinsecam* . . . posse ordinari ad supernaturalem felicitatem, ut ud ultimum finem," lib 3, cap. 11, nn. 4 and 5.

"Dico *secundo*, potestatem civilem non solum non respicere felicitatem aeternam vitae futurae, ut finem ultimum proprium, verum etiam nec *per se* intendere propriam spiritualem felicitatem hominum in hac vita, et consequenter nec *per se* posse in materia spirituali disponere, aut leges ferre." Ibid, n. 6.

"Addo *tertio* potestatem civilem legislativam, etiam in pura natura spectatam, non habere pro fine intrinseco, et *per se* intento, felicitatem naturalem vitæ futuræ . . . sed ejus finem esse felicitatem naturalem communitatis humanae perfectae, cujus curam gerit, et singulorum hominum, ut sunt membra talis communitatis; ut in ea scilicet, in pace et justitia vivant et cum sufficientia bonorum quae ad vitae corporalis conservationem et com-

admit that of its nature it is secular in the sense that it must be aggressively on its guard against doing anything which would even indirectly and mediately foster or promote religion. Nor does the spirit of our political institutions entail so drastic an attitude towards religion that every activity of government must be quarantined against it. The opinion of Justice Shelden, of the Supreme Court of Illinois,[7] has more than a territorial value. "Religion and morality," he says, "are not so placed under the ban of the Constitution that they may not be allowed to become the recipients of any incidental benefit whatsoever from public bodies or authorities of State." The rigid policy of absolute non-intercourse between the State and religion is a recent doctrine of the extreme secularists. The original idea of religious equality which prevailed at the founding of this government they have abandoned for the Masonic idea of religious alienation borrowed from European rationalism. The State must be conceived, they think, as some sublimated essence abstracted from the people, which has gradually become something in character which its citizens neither singly nor collectively are or should be—an irreligious Leviathan. The idea of religious freedom which the founders of this government aimed to secure is embodied in the Federal Constitution and the first amendment to it. It in no way implies the Hegelian State. The Constitution declares that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." By the amendment it was further provided that "Congress shall make no laws respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." By these provisions equal political rights are conceded to every citizen, independently of his religious views, and precaution is taken that no one religious denomination to the exclusion of others get control of the government; but there is no hint that the government should assume towards religion an attitude of negative hostility. Judge Cooley, whose authority in the matter will scarcely be denied, commenting on the amendment, says:[8]

"By the establishment of religion is meant the setting up or recognition of a State Church, or at least the conferring upon one church of special favors and advantages that are denied to others. *It was never intended* by the Constitution that the government

---

moditatem spectant, et cum ea probitate morum quae ad hanc externam pacem et felicitatem reipublicae et convenientem humanae naturae conservationem necessaria est." Ibid, n. 7.

"Potestas (civilis), ut nunc est in principibus Christianis, in se non est major nec alterius naturae quam fuerit in principibus ethnicis." Ibid, n. 9.

[7] Nichols *vs.* School Directors, 93 Illinois.

[8] Principles of Constitutional Law. Students' Series, Chap. XIII.

should be prohibited from recognizing religion, or that religious worship should never be provided for in cases where a proper recognition of Divine Providence in the working of government might seem to require it, and where it might be done without drawing invidious distinctions between different religious beliefs, organization or sects."

The Constitutions of the States adopted and ratified immediately after the Federal Government only gave more express form to this concept of religious freedom. Except in the case of Massachusetts and New Hampshire, which virtually established State churches, their purpose was to safeguard the equal religious rights of their citizens. As Judge Cooley says in the work just cited, "They established a system not of toleration merely, but of religious equality." Some, it is true, exact a belief in the fundamental principles of natural religion as a qualification for the exercise of political rights; but this only confirms what I have said, that the spirit of the times was not a spirit of alienation from religion, but of equal justice towards it. Nor has the general principle that the State cannot take cognizance of religion in those functions of government that touch on the inner lives of citizens ever been universal in its practical application.

Scruples regarding the employment of the public fund to pay salaries for religious services have been set aside, for instance, when there was question of legislators and criminals. These two classes of citizens have been provided with chaplains, whose duty it was either to invoke God's aid or to minister religious instruction and comfort. It is not easy to see on what principle those who occupy our State prisons or reformatories and sit in our halls of legislation are conceded rights that are denied our children. If it be maintained that our legislators need the divine aid to legislate aright, to illumine their minds, to purify their hearts and to strengthen their wills, it may easily be answered that the seeking of that aid may as reasonably be left to the individual consciences of our legislators as the religious instruction and training of children are left to the individual care of parents. If, however, it be urged that legislation, being a supreme act of political power far-reaching in its effects, needs the divine assistance in an especial manner, it will hardly be denied that the making of the future citizens, who are to observe the law enacted by the legislator, is of less importance; and it might even be contended that many of our present lawmakers would be less of a scandal to us, if the schoolhouse of a generation ago had been truly religious. And if religion is recognized as a necessary element in the reformation of our criminals, why may we not look upon it as a necessary element in the formation of our

citizens? Surely from every point of view—humanitarian, economic and social—early formation is better than belated reformation. It used to be thought that an ounce of prevention was better than a pound of cure. Moreover, the general principle, if fully enforced, would lead to a denial of religious liberty. To use for the common good public funds under such conditions as to prevent participation in the benefits accruing therefrom by those who profess a religion recognized in the Constitution of the State as entitled not merely to toleration, but to civil and political equality with others, is practically to put restraints on the freedom of conscience. The opinion of Justice Appleton, of the Supreme Court of Maine, that "a law is not unconstitutional because it may prohibit what a citizen may conscientiously think right, or *require what he may conscientiously think wrong*,"[9] though it is a logical consequence of the political theory that the State may in the prosecution of its end entirely prescind from the religion of its citizens, and act practically and universally as though they had no religion, is nevertheless, in the clause which I have italicized, a clear refusal to acknowledge the citizen's right to freedom of conscience. And the fact that the State does not exert physical force in compulsion does not lessen the tyranny. If the citizen is by law put in such a position that he must either forego the rights of conscience or the right to his share of the common good, he is as effectively deprived of religious equality as though he were imprisoned for his belief.

III.

The first national enactment on the relation of religion to education after the Declaration of Independence is found in the ordinance of 1787, passed by the Congress of the Confederation for the gov-

[9] Donahoe *vs.* Richards, 38 Maine. The Constitution of Maine, of which Justice Appleton was the legal interpreter, supports only the first clause in his opinion. "All men have a natural and inalienable right," it says in Article I., Section 3, "to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences, and no one shall be hurt, molested or restrained in his person, liberty or estate for worshiping God in the manner and season most agreeable to the dictates of his conscience, provided he does not disturb the public peace nor obstruct others in their religious worship." Catholic moralists make a distinction between an affirmative precept of conscience, which they say "*obligat semper sed non pro semper*," and a negative precept of conscience, which they say "*obligat semper et pro semper*." That is to say, an affirmative precept, though its obligation is permanent, does not require that the action prescribed should be unceasingly put, and, moreover, for grave reasons permits its omission; but a negative precept does not, under any circumstance, permit the positing of the action prohibited. Circumstances might arise, for instance, in which the civil authorities could legitimately forbid Catholics for a time to observe the commandment of hearing Mass on Sunday, but under no circumstances could it command them to take part in a worship which their consciences tells them is false.

ernment of the territory lying northwest of the Ohio river and east of the Mississippi, and now comprising the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin and the eastern part of Minnesota. This act ordains "that the following articles shall be considered as articles of compact between the original States and the people and States in said territory, and forever remain unalterable, unless by common consent, to wit: . . . Art. 3. *Religion, morality and knowledge* being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." Furthermore, in the territorial governments provided by Congress for Indiana in 1800, for Michigan in 1805 and for Illinois in 1809, it is in each case enacted: "That there shall be established within said territory a government in all respects similar to that provided by the ordinance of Congress passed on the 13th of July, one thousand seven hundred and eighty-seven." The question whether the provision of the ordinance contained in article 3 laid a permanent obligation on the States organized out of the Northwest Territory to use their schools for the promotion of religion, morality and knowledge may be open to discussion, but there can be no doubt that it is an indication of the public opinion of the time when it was enacted.[10] Of the States formed out of the Northwest Territory Ohio alone on becoming a member of the Union inserted the formula of the Continental Ordinance into its Constitution. In article 8, section 3 of the Constitution of 1802 it declares that, "*Religion, morality and knowledge* being *essentially* necessary to the good government and happiness of mankind, schools and means of instruction shall forever be encouraged by legislative provision not inconsistent with the rights of conscience." Again, in the Constitution of 1851, though the wording of the section is varied, the same motive is assigned for the State's concern with education. Indiana in its two Constitutions, one ratified in 1816 and the other in 1851, declares that "*Knowledge and learning being essential* to the preservation of good government," it shall be the duty of the General Assembly to encourage by all suitable

[10] The decisions of the courts regarding the obligatory character of the ordinance are not uniform. Some held that it was a compact which could not be altered without the consent both of the people of the State and of the United States, given through their representatives, "unless we assume the principle that the sovereign power of a State is not bound by compact." Others held that upon the adoption of a Constitution by one of these States, and its admission into the Union, the ordinance ceased to have effect. This latter opinion is supported by the authority of the Federal Supreme Court. Specifically, Justice Cassoday in 1899 held, in the case known as State *vs.* District Board, that the third article of the ordinance "became superceded and ceased to be longer in force in Wisconsin by that State's admission into the Union." See Cooley's Constitutional Limitations, Seventh Edition, p. 54, n. 1.

means *moral*, intellectual, scientific and agricultural improvement. The educational clause of Minnesota's Constitution, ratified in 1857, is more cautious. "The stability of a republican form of government," it says, "depending mainly upon the intelligence of the people, it shall be the duty of the Legislature to establish a general and uniform system of public schools." The other three States—Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin—simply instruct their respective Legislatures to provide educational facilities without assigning any reason why education should be considered a function of government. We have, therefore, four types: States which base the Legislature's duty of promoting education on the principle that religion, morality and knowledge is necessary for good citizenship, or on the necessity of morality and knowledge for that purpose, or simply on the necessity of intelligence, and States that assign no principle for the civil authorities assuming the duty of education.

The other States admitted as members of the Union after Ohio put themselves by their first Constitutions into one or other of these classes, though many of them changed their views in subsequent Constitutions. Mississippi in 1817 adopted the formula of the Continental Ordinance, which it reiterated in 1832. But in 1868 it omits all reference to religion, being satisfied that "the stability of a republican form of government depends mainly upon the intelligence and virtue of the people." Arkansas, following the lead of Indiana, declares in 1836 that "knowledge and learning, generally diffused through a community," are "essential to the preservation of a free government." Having thought better of it in 1868, it ordains in the Bill of Rights that "Religion, morality and knowledge being essential to good government, the General Assembly shall pass suitable laws to protect every religious denomination in the peaceable enjoyment of its own mode of public worship; and *to encourage schools and the means of instruction.*" However, it experienced another change of mind in 1874. The section of the Bill of Rights is retained so far as it relates to the protection of every religious denomination in the peaceful enjoyment of its own mode of public worship. But the clause making the necessity of religion, morality and knowledge the reason for encouraging schools is suppressed, and in place of it is substituted section 7 of the article on education, which says that "*intelligence and virtue*, being the safeguards of liberty and the bulwark of a free and good government, the State shall ever maintain a general, suitable and efficient system of free schools." The experience of Kansas in making Constitutions is unique. Four are said to have been ratified within five years. In the Topeka Constitution of 1855 the necessity of religion, morality and knowledge for good government is given as a reason

for encouraging education. In the Constitution adopted at a convention which met at Lecompton in 1857 the reason becomes the essential need of a general diffusion of knowledge for the same purpose. In the Mineola Constitution of 1858, the declaration of the Topeka Constitution is reasserted in the Bill of Rights, while at the same time in article 8 "the stability and perpetuity of free republican institutions" is said to "depend upon the intelligence and virtue of the people, and for this reason "every child in the State shall be entitled to receive a good common school education at the public expense." Finally, in the Constitution of 1859, under which Kansas was admitted into the Union, all attempt to assign any principle on which the State should take care of education is abandoned. Missouri, in 1820, merely ordains that education is to be encouraged and enjoins upon its General Assembly the duty of guarding educational funds and of providing schools "where the poor shall be taught gratis." But in 1865 it borrows seemingly from the Texas Constitution of 1845 the phrasing of its educational enactment. This in its turn had been copied apparently, though more concisely worded, from the Maine Constitution of 1820. Missouri, however, attempts to improve it. The first section of its article on education reads: "A general diffusion of knowledge and intelligence being essential to the preservation of the rights and liberties of the people, the General Assembly shall establish and maintain free schools for the gratuitous instructions of all persons in this State between the ages of five and twenty-one." Again, in 1875, it asserts the same close connection between "free schools for the gratuitous instruction" of its future citizens, a general diffusion of "knowledge and intelligence" and the preservation of the rights and liberties of the people.[11] A great number of the States

[11] A comparison of the educational provisions of these Constitutions and those of Massachusetts and Rhode Island may be a matter of curiosity, if not of amusement. Massachusetts in 1780 declared that "*wisdom and knowledge, as well as virtue,* diffused generally among the body of the people" are "necessary for the preservation of their rights and liberties," and in a prolix sentence of one hundred and sixty words imposes on its legislature and magistrates the duty of cherishing educational interests, of encouraging institutions of education, and of countenancing and inculcating numerous virtues, among which it does not neglect to include "good humor." Maine, displeased perhaps with the verbosity of its mother State, drops "wisdom" and "virtue," and declares in one short, clear sentence that "a general diffusion of education" is essential to the preservation of the people's rights and liberties, without defining, as so many of the other States endeavor to do, what are the elements of education. Rhode Island, which until 1842 had managed without other Constitution than its colonial charter from Charles II., in that year drafted and ratified a Constitution, by the educational provision of which it rejected "wisdom" with Maine, but retained "virtue" with Massachusetts. "A diffusion of knowledge, as well as of virtue," it thought, was needed for the preservation of popular rights and liberties. Texas in

assume that education is a function of government without appealing to any theoretical principle. So far as I know—I have not been able to consult the latest Constitutions of some of the States—the only States at the present time that give a constitutional standing to religion in its relation to education are Ohio, North Carolina and Nebraska.

Besides this omission, which has gradually become established, there is another phase in the growth and development of our constitutional provisions regarding religion which is worth noticing. The early Constitutions, after declaring liberty of conscience and liberty of worship natural and indefeasible rights, generally make compulsory support of any religious ministry or place of worship, or any preference by government of one religious denomination over another unlawful. The Constitution of Maryland of 1776, which remained unchanged until 1851, except for some amendments not substantially affecting the provision which I am going to cite, in the Bill of Rights ordains that "all persons professing the *Christian* religion are equally entitled to protection in their religious liberty . . . nor ought any person to be compelled to frequent, maintain or contribute to maintain, unless on contract, any particular place of worship or any particular ministry; yet the Legislature may, in their discretion, lay a general and equal tax for the support of the Christian religion, leaving to each individual the power of appointing the payment over of the money collected from him to the support of any particular place of worship or ministry. . . ." Pennsylvania and Tennessee, though guaranteeing by their Constitutions religious equality, deny political rights to one who does not believe in God and in a future state of rewards and punishments. Other States pronounce a man ineligible for public office who denies the existence of a Supreme Being. In general the religious freedom which was a fundamental principle of early Constitutions is far removed from the principle of extreme secularity advocated to-day.

Later these constitutional provisions for safeguarding religious equality were amplified. The rise and spread of the public school system necessitated a special application of general principles. Accordingly we find Maine in 1820 forbidding its Legislature to donate, grant or endow any literary institution "unless at the time of making such endowment the Legislature of the State shall have

1845 announced that "a general diffusion of knowledge" would serve the purpose. When Missouri, in 1865, tried to formulate its belief, it probably felt that a diffusion of knowledge was insufficient, and so added a diffusion of intelligence, both diffusions to be effected "by free schools for the gratuitous instruction of all persons in the State between the ages of five and twenty-one."

the right to grant any further powers, to alter, limit or restrain any of the powers vested in any such literary institution;" and Michigan in 1835 prohibiting the use of public money "for the benefit of religious societies or theological or religious seminaries. About 1850 this constitutional prohibition took another shape. Ohio in its Constitution of 1851 expresses it thus: "No religious or other sect or sects shall ever have any *exclusive rights to or control* of any part of the school funds of this State." This denial of exclusive rights to or control of the school fund by a religious sect is, about the same time and shortly afterwards, found in the Constitution of other States in practically the same form of words. None of these provisions, however, do more than forbid in the particular matter of schools the preference of one religious denomination to another, which is already generally prohibited in the Bills of Rights. They would not, for instance, if construed according to the sense of the words, render subventions to denominational schools for educational work done unconstitutional, provided these schools were subject to State supervision, and all were treated with equal fairness. But after the Civil War a marked spirit of opposition to the teaching of any religion in the public schools began to appear. Various forms of enactments, which more properly belong to the deliberative action of the legislature than to the organic law, were injected into the Constitutions for the purpose of making public education strictly non-sectarian. This non-sectarianism consisted at first in this, that religious instruction in the schools should be confined to the reading of King James' version of the Bible without note or comment; but has come in due course of time, as was to be expected, to signify the absolute exclusion of religious teaching from the public schools. Nevada in 1864 furnishes the earliest example, I believe, of the formula which is now adopted by many States. In the article of the Constitution on education it says: "No sectarian instruction shall be *imparted or tolerated* in any school or university that may be established under this Constitution." Nebraska in its Constitution of 1875, in spite of its inserting article 3 of the Ordinance of 1787 in its Bill of Rights, repeats the Nevada formula in the article on education. Colorado in 1876 and California in 1879 do the same. In the meantime Illinois in 1870 attempted so to word a prohibition against the payment of any money from the public treasury to a denominational school which should engage in providing what all the States concurred in holding essential to rights and liberties, that its evasion would become impracticable. This provision is interesting for the judicial opinions it gave rise to. The provision runs thus: "Neither the General Assembly, nor any county, city, town, township, school

district, or other public corporation shall ever make any appropriation or pay from any public fund whatever anything *in aid* of any church, or sectarian purpose, or *to help support or sustain* any school, academy, seminary, college, university or other literary or scientific institution controlled by any church or sectarian denomination whatever; nor shall any grant or donation of land, money or other personal property ever be made by the State or any such public corporation to any church or for any sectarian purpose."

Two actions at law which arose under this provision are noteworthy. The first occurred in 1887, and is known as the case of Millard *vs.* Board of Education. The facts of the case are briefly these: The district school board in St. Clair county, Illinois, being unable to provide otherwise, maintained one of the public schools in the basement of a Catholic church; the board appointed as teachers of this school only Catholics, and agreed to pay $600 as rent for the use of the basement; Catholic children with their teachers were obliged by the pastor of the church to assemble at 8 A. M. to hear Mass, and after Mass to have instruction and recitations in catechism until 9 A. M.; the school exercises then commenced and continued until noon, when the Angelus was said by pupils and teachers. Objection was made to paying the rent agreed upon on the ground that it was a violation of the provision of the Constitution which I have just cited. The case came finally before the Supreme Court of the State and was decided in favor of the Board of Education, and consequently of the Catholic pastor who had rented the basement of his church. Justice Craig, who handed down the decision of the court, said:

a. "If the district where the school was maintained had no school house, and it became necessary for the Board of Education to procure a building to be used for school purposes, they had the right to rent of any person who had property suitable for school purposes; whether the owner was a Methodist, a Presbyterian, a Roman Catholic or any other denomination was a matter of no moment; nor was it material that the building selected had been used as a church."

b. "The school authorities may select a teacher that belongs to any church or no church, as they think fit."

c. "That children of Catholic parents and teachers are required to attend at the church at certain hours on school days, and hear Mass said by the priest . . . forms no ground of complaint;" since "there is no intimation that the Board of Education requires anything of this character. . . . Besides, attending Mass at the church has nothing to do with the school or its management," and on what ground "the complainant can complain because others, in

no way connected with him, may be required to attend Mass at the church we cannot comprehend."

d. The next allegation regarding instruction in catechism he disposes of the same way; because it is not claimed that such instruction is "directed, ordered or required by the Board of Education, or that they have anything to do with it;" nor "that the complainant's children are required against his will or desire to attend any religious or sectarian instruction in the school."

e. The allegation regarding the recital of the Angelus is disposed of on the ground that "it is nowhere claimed in the bill that this prayer is required by any regulation of the Board. . . . So far as it appears it is a merely voluntary matter among teachers and scholars which in no wise injures complainant."

In the following year, however, a more stringent interpretation was put upon the words "in aid of any church or sectarian purpose" by Justice Magruder, of the same court of Illinois, in the case of County of Cook *vs.* Chicago Industrial School for Girls. It should be remarked that in the decision of Millard *vs.* Board of Education Justice Magruder is on record as non-concurring. The Chicago Industrial School for Girls was a corporation which was entitled by law to take charge of girls committed to it by the courts. It had no buildings, but sent the girls either to St. Joseph's Orphan Asylum or the House of Good Shepherds, and to these institutions the incorporators of the Industrial School turned over the money paid by the County of Cook. This was the situation when officials of the County of Cook refused to pay the incorporators for the support and care of the girls committed to them, contending that such payment would be in aid of a sectarian purpose, and therefore a violation of the Constitution. In pleading their case before the court the incorporators did not deny that the institutions to which they sent the girls were sectarian, but contended that only State appropriations to be used by managers of religious institutions without restraint or liability to account are referred to in the Constitution; that, provided there is a consideration for the money paid out, it cannot be said that these institutions are "aided." Justice Magruder rejected this interpretation of the Constitution for two reasons. The two clauses of the constitutional provision, he said, prohibit different things: the first clause prohibits appropriations and payments "in aid of" or "to help support or sustain" sectarian institutions; the second prohibits grants or donations to them. Unless there is a distinction between these two clauses, the second is surplusage. But surplusage in our Constitution is to the legal or judicial mind unthinkable. Again, it cannot be held, he said, that a contribution is no aid to an institution, because such

contribution is made in return for services rendered or work done. A school is aided by the tuition paid by its pupils, even though it gives an equivalent for money received. It is none the less true that a merchant is aided by his customers, though the relation between them is that of a buyer and seller. In this interpretation, therefore, of the phrases "in aid of," "to help support or sustain" there is only one way in which the State can observe the ordinations of its own Constitution, and that is by boycotting absolutely every religious institution. The idea of religious equality has been transformed into one of veiled hostility. The note of "religious" attached to an institution puts it under the ban of the Constitution as an alien thing with which the State can have no dealing. The law of Illinois as interpreted by Justice Magruder is undoubtedly the latest stage in the evolution of a movement to exclude religion from our national life, to put a wall of excommunication between it and that education which we so solemnly proclaim is "essential to the preservation of the rights and liberties of the people," "necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind" and "the stability of a republican form of government."

Nor is the reading of the Bible in the schools, to which so many sincere persons anchor their hope of yet retaining religion in the schools, any more secure than religion itself. It, too, is destined to go, and for the same reason that religion has gone; it is a sectarian book. There is a wide difference between the Supreme Court of Maine in 1854,[12] which decided that the Protestant version of the Bible was an unsectarian book, and that a Catholic child who refused to read it, even though she was willing to read the Douay version, might be dismissed from the school without violating her constitutional rights, and the Supreme Court of Wisconsin in 1899,[13] which decided that the stated reading of any version of the Bible in the public schools, even when unaccompanied by any comment, was "sectarian instruction" within the meaning of the phrase as used in the Constitution. But I think it cannot be doubted, in view of the conglomerate religious character of the people who constitute our States, that the judgment of the Supreme Court of Wisconsin will prevail. It is true that there have been recent decisions in some States permitting the reading of the Bible in the class rooms of the public schools; but in some of them there was no constitutional provision forbidding religious instruction in the public schools, and in the one in which there was such a provision the legal character of the decision does not argue its own permanency. The decision of a court is not the law, but only *prima facie*

[12] Donahoe *vs.* Richards, 38 Maine.
[13] State *vs.* District Board, 76 Wisconsin.

evidence, that is to say, not always conclusive evidence, of what the law is. If that decision is an evasion of an evident provision of a Constitution it will, unless the Constitution itself be amended, inevitably be reversed. If, therefore, the California, Colorado, Nevada and Nebraska type of Constitution be adopted universally, the Bible also must go out of the public schools. Its retention could only be justified by reducing it to the level of literature, as was advocated a few years since by the American Educational Association, or by putting it in the same category with the Iliad and the Koran, as the Supreme Court of Nebraska did.[14]

It is Gioberti, I think, who says that men fought almost wholly for power or gain before the incarnation of Christ; but that since the incarnation they fought largely for ideas, especially religious ideas. When the ideas, the creed and the dogma of the Bible become to us as unsubstantial and remote as the Olympic divinities and the Moslem faith, when its value shall have become merely literary, it will be a matter of no importance whether it is read in the public school or not. It will not be worth fighting for; we shall have returned to the condition of those who lived before the incarnation.

IV.

These, then, are the facts. Our public schools at the best are religious only in so far as the mere reading of the Bible is retained in them; and the tendency is to abolish this. The question of their relation to the morality of the country, space does not permit me to discuss; but the power that sustains morality is gone out of them. If we remember that the men and women of to-day were the school children of a generation since, and review the degrading, corrupt and lawless features of our national life which in recent years have become prominent, we may form our own judgment regarding the moral influence exerted by our public schools. What effect, therefore, has the educational literature of the last three-quarters of a century had on the moral and religious character of the training and instruction given under the ægis of the State? It would be a waste of time to show by citation that our organic and statute laws regarding education is a reflex of that literature. Occasionally a voice crying in the wilderness raised a protest against principles or practices that have led *recto tramite* to the present educational condition; but that voice was unheeded or drowned in the clamor of laudation and pseudo-patriotism that greets any criticism of defects in our public school system. To much of that laudation no one can reasonably demur; it would be easy to say with truth many

[14] State *vs.* Scheve.

things in praise of our public schools. One fundamental defect, however, obscures their good qualities in the eyes of those who still hold the conviction that the parables of the two houses, one of which was built on a rock and the other on sand, conveys a lesson of prudence and wisdom. However imposing the public school system may be in appearance, it is thousands of years behind the age in the foundation it lays for the upbuilding of an efficient type of character.

In many respects the interests and outlook of the age of Plato differ widely from those of our own time; but in nothing, I think, is the contrast stronger than in the respective views of Plato and many modern educators regarding the fundamental principles of education; and the contrast is not to the discredit of the pagan. Plato insisted with all the powers of his transcendant intellect that the first care of the rulers of his ideal republic should be an education providing primarily for morality and religion. Our modern educators, after so many centuries, during which the sublime doctrines of Christianity have held sway, refashioning the judgments of men, reforming their convictions, elevating their aspirations, hopes and ideals, have succeeded in excluding the formal teaching of religion from the common schools of every State and Territory and in persuading a vast number of American citizens to accept, instead of the teaching of Christian morality, an umbral and emotional substitute based on no authority and secured by no adequate sanction. They have made the communication of religious instruction and the inculcation of Christian morality in those schools illegal. They have created a widespread conviction that this irreligious policy of education is the highest educational policy which the people of the United States are capable of attaining. It may seem strange, but it is an incontrovertible fact that so far as the fundamental aspects of education are concerned we have retrograded to principles that antedate Christianity and were disowned by pagan wisdom. This is a fact of curious significance—the most distinctive, notable and serious fact of our educational history.

To what causes are we to attribute it? Its origin, growth and lustihood are not to be explained by calling from the vasty deep such impalpable entities as the genius of our people, the spirit of our national life, the secular idea, an atheistic figment, or the zeitgeist, an abstraction made in Germany; because these words so far as they have any ideas behind them, signify the prevailing convictions of men at a given time. And the dominating prevalence of certain convictions is not explained by giving it another and a more vague name, even though that name be written in capital letters. Historical facts are, of course, effects of antecedent causes

acting as a rule steadily through a series of years, sometimes through secular periods. The progress of the movement by which they are produced may often be imperceptible to those who are carried onward by the current. It may be understood by those who take their bearings from subjective impressions to be an advance towards a goal, when it is in fact a recession from it or an ebbing tide when it may be flowing. The stream of an historical movement may seem retrograde, aberrant and lawless, or progressive, direct and uniform to him who fixes his eyes on small segments of its course, and never raises them to ascertain his direction by the light of a ruling luminary. But whatever the historical facts, they differ from other facts around us in that among their antecedent causes stand preëminently the coöperation of human activity and the directive power of human will. The primal impulses, intuitive wisdom and moral instincts of human nature may stay a social movement or deflect it from a course that leads to a haven of confusion; as, on the other hand, self-interest, estimated by the outlook of an economic day, the wisdom of unhumanizing philosophies or the dominance of great passions, may turn it into channels of degrading prosperity and demoralizing glory. The course of history may be changed, ennobled or depraved by the human agents that apparently drift along its surface, and its character at any given period is the resultant of the error or wisdom, the virtue or unrighteousness of preceding generations working through and with the present.

Furthermore, men do not act in unison unless under the influence of a common purpose and a common perception of the good to be obtained through the realization of that purpose; nor do they preserve over a long period of time continuously uniform action looking to the attainment of their purpose, unless under the guidance and government of a central directive power. The uninterrupted, methodical and progressive constancy with which the people of this vast nation have been working for nearly seventy-five years to get the least vestiges of religion out of their schools, would seem then to import the patient, tireless, determined and far-seeing efforts and direction of some hidden central power. The gradual but effective step by which this irreligious situation has been produced, the continuity with which social forces have been directed to bring it about, the steadiness and uniformity with which it has grown throughout every State of the Union, the fervor with which its apostles, however divergent and conflicting their views about details, have preached its fundamental principles, the subserviency with which it is accepted, even by those who loathe its tendency, the pæans of glorification of it that the slightest occasion will pro-

voke from men of the most different temperaments, politics and religions, the ostrich-like blindness of all parts of the community to its concededly ruinous effect on religious, moral and civic character—these aspects of this significant fact would seem to suggest the activity and rule of some such central power. The human mind naturally attributes a constant, uniform and universal effect to a commensurate cause.

The educational fact, therefore, consists in this, that virtually there is a national alliance to cut out of the curricula of our public schools those disciplines and studies that are essential to the formation of citizenship and the preservation of civilization, and that this alliance, so far as we can see, is directed slowly, cautiously and progressively towards the accomplishment of this purpose by some central agency unknown to us.

TIMOTHY BROSNAHAN, S. J.

Woodstock College, Md.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM IN RUSSIA (1796-1825).

I.

THE five years' reign of Paul I. (1796-1801) closed the eighteenth century in Russia in a sombre and inauspicious way, while his violent death opened the series of vindictive assassinations that disfigure the pages of modern Muscovite history, and recall the worst days of imperial Roman and Byzantine administration. He had good natural abilities and had received a suitable education. But the jealousy of Catharine kept him secluded; he was relieved of the education of his own children and forbidden to exhibit himself to the army. Her favorites, moreover, humiliated him.[1] At his accession he had reached the age of forty-two, was skilled in military affairs, but after the style of the Prussian army, and entertained no small degree of self-respect. He was a true autocrat, and said on one occasion: "There is no superior person in Russia except the one whom I address, and he is such only while I speak with him." During his long seclusion from public affairs he had surrounded himself with spies and personal agents, and

[1] There is a mixture of contempt and fear in the story told by Count Fedor Golovkine in his memoirs of Emperor Paul, "La Cour et le Régne de Paul I.," Paris, 1905, p. 103. According to Golovkine, Catharine warned Paul, by the mouth of her favorite Panine, that he was her illegitimate child, and not entitled to succeed her—hence he must abandon all intrigues. For a curious trait that throws light on the shameful immorality of contemporary Northern courts, see *op. cit.*, pp. 383-384.

arrived at the throne well posted with notes as to the principal personages at the court of his mother Catharine. His accession was the signal for a reversing of the régime of the dead Empress. He had always been troubled as to his father's death and shown himself something of a Hamlet. Almost his first act was to cause the disinterment of the body of Peter III., that had been ignobly buried in the cemetery of the convent of St. Alexander Nevsky. The remains of the Emperor were re-interred in a catafalque and placed beside those of Catharine. Prince Orloff, the alleged murderer of Peter III., and his accomplice, Bariatinski, were compelled to figure prominently in the ceremonies by which the memory of Peter was rehabilitated; afterward they were exiled. Paul took a delight in undoing the work of Catharine or her advisers, and as an earnest of this temper ordered the destruction of the splendid monument that Catharine had built over the remains of Potemkin. In general he was a violent reactionary. The French Revolution aroused in him feelings of detestation, and while he lived there was an end of the French domination in St. Petersburg; not only the arts and letters of France were tabooed, but especially the political ideas and institutions of the Republic. Native Russian costumes and habits were resurrected, and all the powers of autocracy set in motion in order to undo in Russian society the work of his bold and unprincipled mother. The Russian capital was quickly transformed and began to look more like Moscow or "Lord Novgorod" than Paris. Paul declared himself the protector of the fallen monarchs of Europe and even went so far as to offer (1796) a refuge to Pius VI.[2] What his reception would have been may be gathered from the hatred always shown the Papacy by Platon, the Archbishop of Moscow. He declared that the Popes were a succession of Anti-Christs and the Cardinals agents of the devil.[3] The Emperor was, after all, profoundly religious by nature; he loved the ceremonies of the Church, and was occasionally moved to tears by the discourses of his metropolitan, whom he afterwards treated quite unceremoniously. In the fragment of personal memoirs of Count Golovkine, just published, there is a curious trait of Cæsaropapism that recalls the well-known story of Maximilian I. and his plan to become at once emperor, pope and saint.

There took place about this time (1797) an affair that was kept quiet, but which caused men to reflect. The Emperor made up his mind that as head of the Church he would say Mass. Not daring to commit so great an innovation in the capital, he resolved to say his first Mass at Kasan, whither he was then going. The costliest vestments were made for him. He meant

[2] The Pope was solicited to go to St. Petersburg, but excused himself on the plea of his great age, the climate and the inconvenience of an existence in the heart of a schismatic church. Golovkine, *op. cit.*, p. 138.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 141.

also to become the confessor of his family and his ministers. With admirable presence of mind, the Synod saved him from these follies. At the first mention of his design no surprise was shown, though all were thunderstruck; at the same time it was explained to him that the canons of the Greek Church forbade the celebration of Mass by a priest who had been twice married. He had not thought of this, and, as he dared not or did not wish to change the laws concerning the priesthood, he gave up his project. He consoled himself, however, by putting on, at his prayers, a little short dalmatic of red velvet and embroidered with pearls. His thin and slight figure was certainly a very curious object on such occasions, since he continued to wear at the same time his uniform, long boots, three-cornered hat and powdered queue.[4]

His determination to do ever the contrary of what had been done in the former reign would have inclined him favorably toward the Catholics of his vast domains. He had been favorably impressed by the reception accorded to him by Pius VI. and the Romans on the occasion (1790) of his European voyage while yet only heir-presumptive to the throne of all the Russias. He renewed the relations of the Empire with the Holy See and received with distinction the Apostolic Nuncio, Lorenzo Litta, formerly Nuncio at Warsaw and a member of one of the most distinguished families of Northern Italy. By the bull *Maximis undique pressi* (October 16, 1798) Pius VI. reorganized the diocesan system of the Catholics of Russia. To the United Greeks were allotted the three dioceses of Polock, Luck and Brzesc; to the Latins the sees of Mohilev (metropolitan), Samogitia, Wilna, Luck, Kamieniec and Minsk. As a special favor the Catholics of the Empire were freed from the jurisdiction of the College of Justice, a purely Greek ecclesiastical court. In its place was created a Roman Catholic College of Justice, or Supreme Council, the presidency of which was accorded to Siestrencewicz, the metropolitan of Mohilev. This is the origin of the ecclesiastical tribunal known as the "Catholic College" of St. Petersburg, which has been often recast, but has never ceased to afflict the consciences of all Russian subjects who acknowledge the spiritual supremacy of the Holy See. For the present, the mere fact that its action was dominated and directed by the metropolitan of Mohilev could inspire only fear and suspicion among all Catholic Ruthenians, Lithuanians and Poles. It was not long before Siestrencewicz obtained the dismissal of the Papal Nuncio, and shortly afterward an ukase (November 3, 1798) that placed all Catholic religious orders within the episcopal jurisdiction of Mohilev. Had Paul obeyed his original good impulses, it would have needed no new laws to restore peace and security to so many millions of his troubled subjects; it would have been sufficient to execute the promises, edicts and treaties of Catharine. But of what avail were the parchments of the dead Empress so long as the evil genius of Catholicism lived and continued to apply against its

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 149-150.

adherents all the cunning of ancient Byzantium, all the maxims of the royal Protestantism of Prussia and all the jealous fetters of Austrian Febronianism? It seemed as though the adverse fates of Russian Catholicism had conspired to meet in the brain of one man and to prolong his odious existence in such a way that Peter the Great and Nicholas I. might converse with one another as to the best means of destroying the authority of Rome within the limits of the new Russia. In his quality of president of the Roman Catholic College of Justice the metropolitan of Mohilev united in his own hands the entire administration of Russian Catholicism. There was no appeal save to himself, the final control reserved to the imperial senate being at all times unlikely to favor the interests of Catholicism. Siestrencewicz was thus in possession of a kind of patriarchate from which all action of the Holy See was carefully excluded. Such a situation was destined to call forth protest from the independent representatives of Catholicism still to be found in Russia. The religious orders, notably the Jesuits, appealed to the Czar against the travesty of justice represented by the presence of Siestrencewicz at the head of the new College of Justice; he was obliged to hand in his resignation and retire to his diocese. His place was taken by his coadjutor, Benislawski. This ex-Jesuit remained but a short time at the head of the department, long enough, however, to bring its administration into conformity with the spirit of the Church. He obtained from Paul I. the restitution of the property of the Jesuits. They were given charge of the Catholics in St. Petersburg, and were permitted to open schools and colleges in any part of Russia. Finally the Society of Jesus was restored in Russia (March 7, 1801) by Pius VII., at the request of the Czar. A few days later (March 23) the latter was murdered by conspirators headed by the German barons Pahlen and Bennigsen. His mutable impetuous temper made even his wife and heir fear for their personal safety; his costly foreign wars had affected the revenues of the Russian nobility and the welfare of the State; the glorious career of his great general Suwarow had ended in such defeats as Zürich and Bergen; his own unselfish principles had caused his betrayal by Austria and England, and the loss of many thousand Russian lives to whom the interests of Europe were of little importance; he was even now thinking of moving like a new Alexander to the conquest of India, as an adequate revenge for the treason of England in his regard. It seemed that the hour of this terrible dreamer had come. He was strangled obscurely in a hand-to-hand conflict with his assailants, to the infinite disgust of his new-found friend, Bonaparte, and the incredible joy of his former ally, England.

II.

The reign of Alexander I. (1801-1825) is in many ways typical of all Russian life and thought in the nineteenth century. On the one hand we see the noblest aspirations and efforts for the improvement of Russian humanity, and on the other a return to the sternest autocracy. The Emperor began his career under the guidance of such liberal minds as Adam Czartoryski, Nowossilitzof and Strogonof, friends of his youth, with whom he had often discussed the creation of a free and intelligent Russia. It was allowed to speak of rights and duties; the civil administration underwent many reforms in a modern sense; the emancipation of the serfs was taken up with earnestness; public instruction was planned on a broad scale and in a practical manner. It seemed as though a new life had begun to pulsate in the veins of the sons of Russ.[5]

The son of a village pope, Speranskij, who had risen from the office of an ecclesiastical instructor to the highest place in the Empire, was long the mentor of the Emperor and the executor of his liberal ideas. He dominates the first half of the reign of Alexander—when he fell (1812) a new era began, the period of reaction.[6] The decisive share of Russia in the great coalitions against Napoleon had developed the ever-latent Cæsarism of the Russian ruler, and also a mystical feeling of solicitude and responsibility for a universal peace, to be accomplished by measures of reaction and oppression. clearly on the minds of his new counsellors, and with the new consciousness came also the determination to root out all Western forces, all Latin centres of resistance or interference. War and military colonization were opening up extensive regions for the native Russians to enter upon and civilize after their own semi-barbarian Muscovite notions.[7] The first germs of political panslavism were planted, and the policy inaugurated that was to lead Russia to the forefront of universal domination. The old established Ger- In the meantime the vocation of "Holy Russia" dawned ever more man influence that had dominated in the latter half of the eighteenth century, and the shorter-lived French ascendency of the reign of

[5] "Mémoires et Correspondance du Prince Adam Czartoryski," Paris, 1887, 2 vols., and the "Mémoires of La Harpe," Paris, 1864; Bogdanovitch, "History of Alexander I.," St. Petersburg, 1869-1871, 6 vols. (Russian); Schnitzler, "Histoire intime de la Russie sous les empereurs Alexandre et Nicolas," 2 vols., Paris, 1847; Pypine, "The Intellectual Movement Under Alexander I.," St. Petersburg, 1885 (Russian).

[6] Speranski, "Lettres à Sotlichine (1818 ff), à Zeir (1814-1817)," St. Petersburg, 1870; Korff, "Life of Count Speranski," 2 vols., 1861 (Russian)), St. Petersburg.

[7] For the military colonies of Araktschejewf, see Rambaud, "Histoire de la Russie," Paris, 1884, c. 35.

Catharine, were doomed to extinction. The House of Romanoff was to become the leader of the Russian masses, to express and execute autocratically the unconscious Russian idea, even as a Titus or a Trajan stood for the purposes of the Roman people. No doubt there were real forces of a popular character behind all this, vague and unclear aspirations of a strong race, raw and undeveloped, emotional and religious, yet multitudinous, and placed advantageously on the vast marches between Europe and the remotest Orient. It had done great things in conflict with the upstart Latin Cæsar; it had fired Moscow and forced the disastrous passage of the Beresina; it had subdued and trained Cossack and Tartar and nameless Oriental hordes; it had found voices of incredible eloquence and pathos, of fresh native grace and distinction, to tell the world of Europe what the Slav thought and hoped; it had looked on the old and the new constitutions of Europe as models exposed in open market, and finally rejected them all, in the hope of adapting its immemorial institutions to the new conditions of life. The indecision of Paul and of the youthful Alexander was pushed aside by such great domestic forces and in its place was set up a Slav world-purpose that really began with Nicholas II. (1825), and has been but now right vigorously challenged and balked by the little brown men of Nippon. We may recall once more that it is scarcely more than a century since Emperor Paul and Napoleon conceived (1801) the "grand plan" by which Russian and French armies were to penetrate into India and overthrow the rule of England. It would seem as though divine providence were bent on compelling an internal renovation of Old Muscovy before she is allowed to set up as the ideal political force among us moderns. Again and again, by fair means and foul, has "Adam Bear" striven to consolidate in the Far Orient the work of the marvelous Macedonian boy-conqueror, and as often has he been driven back. It seems probable, now, that when the "Russian God" again summons his people to overflow Eastward, it will be with a chastened spirit and a healthier sense of the Slav's political place and capacities.

We may return from this digression with the remark that a small percentage of the Russian clergy, the educated monastic element, was largely responsible for the frightful injustices henceforth committed against Roman Catholicism throughout the Russian dominions. No doubt the anti-Romanism of Northern Germany—Encyclopedist hatred, Bavarian Illuminism and Austrian Febronianism—had contributed powerfully to the Russian distrust and contempt of genuine Catholicism. But all these influences found a receptive and favorable atmosphere among ecclesiastics who had for many centuries been under the baleful influence of the Greek clergy of

Constantinople. What that meant is readily understood by every student of the documentary sources of the Greek Schism from Photius to the Council of Florence. The humiliation of the patriarch Nicon (1658-1667) and the extinction of the patriarchal power at Moscow (1700) marked the acme of Slavic Erastianism; henceforth the Russian Church is dormant. A vigorous Christian faith lives on and produces signs and evidences of spiritual life and health. But order, progress, originality, independence are lacking; the true bulwark of popular liberty is overthrown and the meanest of political forces, a salaried and selfish bureaucracy, sets its heel on the necks of the people, silences all free speech and criticism and furnishes the nineteenth century with a spectacle of oppression that Caligula might have imitated with envy. The estates of the Russian Church were confiscated by Catharine in 1764; in return a salary has since then been paid by the government to every ecclesiastic, with the result that the whole order has long since ceased to feel any noble stirrings of independence or any sense of original God-given responsibility for the political or social welfare of the people.[8] Did Gregory VII. need a justification for the resounding defeat he inflicted on Western Cæsarism he would find it in the spectacle of the miserable Russian "pope" of to-day and the servile monasticism of the Empire whose highest ambition is to be the political tool of St. Petersburg at Mount Athos or Jerusalem, New York or San Francisco.

III.

By an ukase of November 13, 1801, Siestrencewicz had obtained from Alexander a definitive reorganization of the Roman Catholic College of Justice on lines which made it henceforth the counter-

[8] If we pass to the moral authority, to the influence of the Bishops, we shall not be wrong in affirming that it is almost nil. As to pastoral letters, they are never heard of. The discourses they pronounce on solemn occasions no one cares about. They can be haughty in presence of their clergy, can surround themselves with a certain pomp, demand of their inferiors excessive marks of respect, and, alas, are no bolder or more independent in the presence of the great. They know not how to unite Christian humility with sacerdotal firmness; people never hear them speak with an evangelic liberty. Their action on minds, on society, is nil. They seem to be Bishops only for the purpose of figuring in the pomps of the divine office. The ceremonies of worship in the Oriental rite have, it is true, an inncomparable majesty; in the Russian Church they are performed with a rare perfection. The voice of chanters lends them a marvelous charm, and all this, as a whole, acquires completeness only by the presidency of the Bishop. This is great; this is fine. But these splendors would make no less impression if the Bishop, on laying aside his magnificent ornaments, remained a Bishop still; if he knew how to raise his voice to instruct the people, to denounce abuses and to defend God's rights on earth and those of the Church, of justice, of the humble and lowly.—Gagarin, "The Russian Church," London, 1872, pp. 194-195.

part of the Holy Synod itself, *i. e.*, a perfect machine for the civil domination of the Catholic Church in the Czar's domains. It was in vain that the Catholic Bishops protested (1804); the momentary yielding of Alexander was followed by hateful suggestions of Siestrencewicz that the Emperor was modifying the imperial constitution in favor of a Latin power (Rome). The new department was confirmed and its administration turned over finally to the boldest ecclesiastical traitor of the century. He had sought to be a Cardinal; he was now to all intents and purposes an independent patriarch. He filled this governing board of Russian Catholicism with his own creatures, men said to have been devoid of religious morality or conscience; he excluded at the same time all men of virtue and placed in it two dissolute monks, one of whom, the Franciscan Stankiewicz, soon abandoned Catholicism and took a wife publicly in St. Petersburg. Among the members was the Protestant brother of Siestrencewicz, who, it will be remembered, was a convert. Since then the presence of Protestants in this standing committee on Catholic affairs in Russia has become a tradition. When Pius VII., in the interests of the oppressed Catholics of Russia, sent the legate Tommaso Arezzo to St. Petersburg (1802) the Archbishop of Mohilev procured his dismissal; the presence of a Papal agent would have seriously interfered with the new patriarchal status of Siestrencewicz. At the same time the latter caused the Emperor to issue an order forbidding Siestrencewicz or any other Catholic Bishop to hold any communication with Rome. In this act of violence he had the coöperation of the famous Protestant pietist Frau von Krüdener, under whose influence the Emperor had come. A Russian envoy was stationed at Rome (1803), through whose hands all the Catholic affairs of Russia must pass. In 1804 the Russian chancery complimented the Archbishop of Mohilev on his fidelity in executing the imperial will:

> The habitual sagacity of Your Excellency and your profound sense of duty, proven by your constant fidelity during a long pastoral life, do not permit us to doubt that you will execute with punctuality the wishes of His Majesty. Thereby you will justify the high esteem in which Your Excellency is held because of your faithful performance of the duties of a good and loyal citizen.

A month later (August, 1804) the Emperor broke off all relations with Rome and practically made the Archbishop of Mohilev the patriarch of all Russian Catholics. He proceeded at once to establish himself as the willing tool of Russian autocracy, but met with a decided opposition from the remaining Catholic Bishops, who insisted firmly on the obedience due to the Holy See and the absolute impossibility of any religious administration of Catholicism whence the former was excluded. In order to overcome the righteous opposition of his brethren Siestrencewicz suggested to

the imperial chancery a further manipulation of the standing committee on Catholic affairs. Hitherto the six Latin dioceses of Russia had chosen every three years six assessors who, together with the imperial appointees, constituted the "College of Justice" or governing board of Russian Catholicism. Siestrencewicz proposed to reduce the number of assessors and to withdraw from the dioceses all right of appointment; henceforth the board, diminished by one-half, would be appointed directly and solely by the Czar.

In the above mentioned memoir addressed to Prince Lopouchine, Minister of Justice, and, as we shall see, destined to be kept secret, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Mohilev delivers himself as follows:

These elective members are ignorant as a rule of the civil legislation of the empire; they are also unacquainted with the habits of imperial administration, and are almost entirely unacquainted with the Russian language. The result of all this is seen in the disorder and difficulty that accompany the administration of religious affairs. We may say of these six elective assessors that they are a kind of residents or protectors of all kinds of ancient rights and privileges obtained from Rome. They are not real members of an imperial committee. These men imagine that if they defend the various Roman institutions and privileges they will be held in higher honor by the people of their dioceses than if they execute the laws of Russia. . . . I must say frankly to Your Highness that these six members are nominated according to the imperial decrees of 1800-1801, all of which are contrary to former decrees and to the rules of 1795 for the government of the Catholic clergy. These later decrees are a result of the intrigues and trickery of the monks, whose constant aim it is to have in the college representatives of their own way of thinking. Thereby they hope to maintain the ancient ecclesiastical rights and institutions. We read, for instance, in those decrees that are subsequent to the ancient ukases: "The councils shall be guided in all things according to their own specific rules." Now, these rules dispense them from all submission to any authority other than that of their own superiors. In this way they dispose of considerable ecclesiastical wealth, for which they are accountable and responsible to no one."

Siestrencewicz dared now to take a further step. To the same memoir he added a proposal for a new constitution to be imposed on the Catholic clergy of Russia. It is nothing less than a revolutionary act, and may be looked on as the first measure of execution of the abominable plans by which the fortune of Catholicism in Russia was all but ruined in the succeeding reigns.

As to the second object (of this memoir)—that is, the proposed constitution for the Roman Catholic clergy—I make known to your Highness that in the composition of this plan I have kept constantly in view the laws and decrees of Russia from 1773 to 1800. The unvarying spirit of this legislation contemplates *the government of the Roman Catholic clergy quite along the lines of that which is provided for the State clergy, according to the same imperial legislation, and without any special exemption or any kind of privilege contrary to the laws of the empire.* This legislation further contemplates the retention of the supreme ecclesiastical authority in the hands of the diocesan Bishop. Each one is to direct in his diocese the entire clergy, both secular and regular, and is to render an account of his administration only to the supreme tribunal for Catholic affairs.

The plan which I have drawn up is not such as one might expect from a Roman Bishop, but rather such as a faithful subject ought to propose. Hence, in order to avoid the false interpretations which some ecclesiastics might make of it, on the supposition that the changes thereby effected in the various rules, institutions and privileges obtained by the different dioceses are in some way a violation of religion itself, I humbly beg your Highness, in case you think

it necessary to demand from me the proposed constitution, that it should be communicated to no one else. Your Highness may add to my plan whatever you think useful. You are free also to correct it and, if you desire, to suppress it.

I may state to your Highness that the discontent manifested by badly trained ecclesiastics arises from the fact that *I have at all times tried to guide the clergy according to those ukases of the late Czarina, of blessed memory, and the late Czar,* which were issued in 1795, and not according to the Roman institutions and privileges obtained at different epochs, and which are entirely intolerable in a well organized state, etc., etc. St. Petersburg, October 29, 1806.

In detail the new constitution was the legislation of Catharine in its principal measures, only maliciously recast and arranged by a Roman Catholic Archbishop, who had received from the Holy See the very metropolitan authority by which he was enabled to consummate his daring treason. Among other things he suppressed all canonical collation to benefices and extinguished every trace of independence and autonomy on the part of the religious orders. The chief point of the proposed constitution was the suppression of all appeals to Rome on the plea that by virtue of his canonical institution the metropolitan of Mohilev possessed powers identical with those of the Pope!

Although Siestrencewicz had asked the Minister to keep secret the contemplated measure, a copy of it made its way into faithful hands. Szantyr, a member of the College, reached the procurator of the Holy Synod, Prince Galitzin, with the complaints of his fellow-Catholics and made it clear that such legislation was equivalent to the extinction of Roman Catholicism. Galitzin was honorable enough to lay these complaints before Alexander, who was a just and kindly man when not deceived by intrigues or blinded by suspicions purposely aroused and nourished. As a matter of fact, the propositions of Siestrencewicz were abandoned and Catholicism in Russia was saved from the odious yoke of hopeless slavery that its own chief representative had fashioned for it. This did not prevent him from governing in open and contemptuous disregard of the constitutional rights of the other members of the "College;" his known subserviency won only too easily bureaucratic toleration in matters that turned to the disadvantage of Rome and her religion. In particular his laxity in the granting of divorces made him still more odious in the eyes both of Catholics and non-Catholics.

As time wore on the Jesuits became a special object of dislike to Siestrencewicz. In Russia as in Prussia the civil authority had forbidden the proclamation of the bull of Clement XIV. that dissolved the society. Catharine did not allow its publication even in the Polish provinces, not that she was moved by any interests of Catholicism, but for the sake of education, which would have suffered by the closing of the numerous schools conducted by the Society. She needed them, moreover, for the pacification of a

Catholic population yet smarting under grievous wrongs done by her and whose compulsory apostasy she was yet unable to undertake. She even resisted the demands of the Holy See for the execution of the bull. The Jesuits took the oath of fidelity, after the seizure of White Russia in September, 1772, and were treated thenceforth with distinction and even with partiality. They were assured that the rights of Catholicism would be respected and that they might continue to observe the rules of their order. Siestrencewicz followed in the footsteps of his imperial mistress, and even permitted the opening of a Jesuit novitiate in 1780. Nor did his attitude change while Paul I. lived. The Emperor was rather favorable to the Society and obtained from Pius VII. (1801) their formal reëstablishment in Russia.

The slumbering dislike of Alexander for the Society broke out in 1815. By a decree of December 16 the Jesuit college at St. Petersburg was closed and all members of the society were expelled from that city and from Moscow. No accusation or process, but swift and summary expulsion was their lot. All were arrested in the night of December 22-23, 1815 (January 3-4, 1816), and sent off to Polotzk, whence they were conducted across the frontier. In the homiletic ukase of banishment they are charged with ingratitude, pride and a disturbing spirit. It is said that they undertook to overthrow the immemorial Russian orthodoxy, to sow discord in families and fill the State with disunion, etc. In fact, they had made some remarkable conversions among the better class of Russians, and the haughty ecclesiasticism of Russia had taken umbrage, even begun to tremble.[9] Four years later (1820) they were expelled from Poland, and it was expressly stated that they should never, under any pretext or name, return to the Empire. The principal agent of their disgrace and expulsion was their own co-religionist, Siestrencewicz, who saw in them only troublesome spectators of his iniquity. He had already (1810) done his best, but in vain, to prevent the nomination of a general in succession to Fr. Gruber, but had been defeated with the aid of Prince Galitzin. Count De Maistre is a sufficient witness of this accusation.

"The true author," he says, "of this great wrong[10] is our wretched felon of an Archbishop, a disguised Protestant. Were I to shake that man's hand I would put on a cowhide glove."

The Protestant temper of Siestrencewicz showed very clearly in his relations with the propaganda of the Bible Society. Since 1812 the London Society had been making vigorous headway in Russia and eventually distributed nearly 900,000 copies of the Bible, with-

[9] See the interesting narrative, "Les Jésuites en Russie, récit d'un Jésuite de la Russie blanche," Paris, 1872.

[10] Correspondance diplomatique, II., 305.

out note or comment, in all parts of that vast Empire, besides causing the Bible to be translated into some twenty vernaculars. It had also established nearly three hundred branches. This un-Catholic and often anti-Catholic enterprise appealed to so un-Catholic a man as Siestrencewicz, especially as in the beginning Emperor Alexander was not opposed to the methods and the spirit of the colporteurs. The Archbishop of Mohilev went farther; in a pastoral letter he falsified, with true Byzantine audacity, a decree of the Council of Trent and an almost contemporary letter of Pius VI. For this he was severely reproached by Pius VII. in a letter of September 3, 1816, something that concerned him less than Alexander's contemporary withdrawal of his favor from the proselytizing endeavors of the Bible Society. The Pope's arguments touched the Emperor; he caused the brief to be made public and expelled the agents of the Society.

One of the grievous wounds of Polish society in the eighteenth century had been the ease and frequency of divorce. It is said that only in England was divorce then so common. The nobles and the wealthy were, of course, the principal sinners; as late as 1840 it is stated that every year the small diocese of Minsk could show from two to three hundred divorces. When Alexander sought (1825), at the Diet of Warsaw, the abrogation of civil marriage he was strongly opposed by the Polish nobility, and put his will through only with difficulty and with the aid of the episcopate. Yet the newly adopted Code Civil of Napoleon was in open opposition to the rights of the Church and contradicted formally the provisions of the Council of Trent. Siestrencewicz made no effort to withstand this product of license and infidelity; on the contrary, his venal court continued to encourage such appeals and gave at all times a wretched example to lesser diocesan chanceries.

The failure of Napoleon, apropos of the Russian campaign (1813), to realize the hopes aroused by his short-lived creation of the Grand Duchy of Warsaw (1796-1813) was followed by the re-incorporation with the Russian state of a multitude of Poles who had been hoping in the last two decades for the restoration of the ancient kingdom. The constitution of 1815 guaranteed the exercise of the Catholic religion, and in 1817 the Polish hierarchy was reorganized by Pius VII. Warsaw was made an archiepiscopal see with seven suffragans. The Uniats had still their see of Chelm, with its two hundred parishes. The Emperor, however, continued to put obstacles in the way of communication with Rome, and no young Pole was allowed to visit a foreign university without special permission. Alexander, however, was not unfriendly to Poland; her sons, not without reason, expected at one time the restoration by him of the

venerable "Respublica." Perhaps the spread in his own dominions by the returned soldiers of political liberalism, the growth of secret societies, the increase of patriotic literature and the unhealthy religious atmosphere that surrounded him, were responsible for the abandonment of the noble ideas that he had once entertained and discussed with Adam Czartoryski, and which that noble Pole enshrined for posterity in his famous castle of Pulawy among the relics of his country's fame and greatness. Certainly he was a truer "Pan Tadeusz" than Napoleon, and might have earned, under better auspices, the immortality that Mickiewicz had the bestowal of. In the very year of his death (1825) he ordered the construction of two Catholic churches, one for the Uniat Ruthenians at St. Petersburg, the other for Latin Catholics at Tsarkoe-Selo. The Uniats, moreover, had increased notably in his reign. In 1801 they were 1,398,048; in 1825 they had reached the figure of 1,427,359, an increase kept up until 1834, when they were 1,504,278.

IV.

Did Alexander I. die a Roman Catholic? The evidence for this assertion is not slight or contemptible. In his early youth he seems to have been influenced against Christianity by his French tutor, Laharpe. But the conflagration of Moscow (1812) made a great change in him; thenceforth he resolved to conduct his high office on the most elevated Christian principles. At the Congress of Verona he is reported to have declared that God did not give him an army of 800,000 men for purposes of mere human ambition, but to restore religion, morality and justice to their proper place and to establish anew the reign of order. He became a man of prayer and meditation. It is true that he fell under the influence of German Pietism through Frau von Krüdener, and of the Illuminati through Nicholas Bergasse and Jung-Stilling. But, on the other hand, he was accessible to the religious influence of Madame Swetchine and others of the little coterie of Russian converts to Catholicism. Joseph de Maistre had not lived in vain at the court of St. Petersburg; the elevated concept of the Church and the Pope that shines from that great statesman's pages must have been often laid before Alexander. The Emperor had also met Cardinal Consalvi at London and Vienna, not to speak of many noble and religious émigrés who made Russia their home in those troubled years. Large religious ideas led him to the famous scheme of the Holy Alliance with Prussia and Austria that was supposed to establish compulsory peace on the basis of the Christian Scriptures. The Bible Societies and even the Quakers won a temporary or occa-

sional approval from him; he was an emotional Slav, and as such accessible to profound mystical considerations. Religious unity is the condition of spiritual peace, and it is not unreasonable to suppose that this great warrior, turned an apostle of peace, should come to see that the first condition of lasting religious peace was the restoration of ancient concord. It is said that at the Congress of Aachen (1817) he conversed at length on the Catholic religion with Müllejans, the Catholic pastor of the neighboring village of Würfelen. He sent a donation to the Catholic curé at Geneva and expressed his pleasure that the Holy Father was contented with this gift. In September, 1822, he conversed for two hours on religious subjects with the holy priest Alexander von Hohenlohe. At the end he fell on his knees before the good priest and rising embraced him tenderly. Later he invited him to St. Petersburg, where he frequently saw him. When Alexander was at Vienna in 1822 his mother begged him not to go to Rome, as though she feared the influence of the Father of Christendom. When his brother Constantine married a Catholic Princess of Polish birth he renounced his birthright in favor of his younger brother, Nicholas (II.). Alexander did not make this known officially; it is possible that he meant to wait and see what would follow from his own proposed conversion. If that were accepted by the people Constantine might still reign over Russia.

Alexander was fond of the Piedmontese nobleman, Count Michaud. Moroni states in his "Dizionario" that in 1825 this gentleman was sent by Alexander to Leo XII. with the secret announcement of the imperial intention to put an end to the schism of his people and abjure the errors of Photius, even at the price of martyrdom. Count Michaud was to request of the Holy Father that he send to St. Petersburg a trustworthy religious, either a Camoldolese or a Franciscan. The first choice of the Pope fell on Mauro Capellari, later Gregory XVI., and then on the Franciscan (later Cardinal) Orioli. While the latter was getting ready for his journey the news came that the Emperor had passed away (November 19—December 1, 1825) at Taganrog, in Southern Russia. Moroni asserts (lix., 110, and xxxviii., 57) that he had this information from the lips of Gregory, who also told him that for a certainty Alexander I. had died a Catholic death. In 1844 the Prince de Polignac asserted that he had seen at Paris in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs a despatch saying that Alexander had confessed to a Roman Catholic priest, abjured the Greek Schism and received the last sacraments. It is possible that Fedotof, the Queen's confessor, who attended him, was himself a crypto-Catholic. One is naturally reminded of the death-bed conversion of Charles II., the hurried

visit of the Benedictine Huddlesfield and the devotion of the Duke of York. It is said that when leaving St. Petersburg Alexander bade the Dominicans keep ready an apartment for a priest who would come from Rome. During his stay in Poland he paid a nocturnal visit to a Dominican church and had the Blessed Sacrament exposed for the satisfaction of his devotion. It is said also that the Venerable Anna Maria Taigi beheld in her "mystic sun" that the Emperor had died a Catholic death and was in Purgatory. The narrative of Moroni is confirmed by a written statement (August 22, 1841) of the Count d'Escarène, to the effect that Count Michaud had related to him the fact of his mission to Leo XII. Father Gagarin, a distinguished Russian Jesuit and a scholarly writer on Russian affairs, states that he knew a respectable man to whom Count Michaud had related the same. Gagarin also says that it was a Greek Uniat monk who heard the confession of Alexander on his death-bed. It seems certain that there are at Rome and elsewhere authentic documents that confirm the death of the Emperor in the unity of the Roman Church.[11]

V.

Though Siestrencewicz died in communion with the Apostolic See, he had accomplished, as far as in him lay, the separation of Roman Catholicism in Russia from its rightful head and guide. He was filled with the spirit of schism, and during his too long life abetted all its principles and executed all its designs. He might have imitated a Basil before Modestus, and exhibited a true Bishop to men who had never seen one, or withstood the tyranny of Russian bureaucracy as Eusebius of Vercelli and Dionysius of Milan withstood Constantius when he declared that he was their canon law. Instead of giving full play to the intrinsic power of resistance that yet existed among the Ruthenian and Latin Catholics of Russia he paralyzed all their ardor, misdirected all their efforts, suppressed all their protests, laid bare all their affection for Rome to the worst enemy of Rome. He had only to look about him to behold what ravages had been worked among the Russian clergy by the civil domination of the Czars. It seems as if God had permitted the unspeakable results we yet behold as an eternal warning to the Latin Church of what state control means, and an eternal incitement to enter on the way of martyrdom rather than accept the yoke of secular protection and favor when coupled with authoritative control.[12]

[11] Moroni, "Dizionario," LIX., 110; XXXVIII., 57; "Civiltà Cattolica (ninth series), XII., 349-352; "Etudes Religieuses," July, 1877, 26-50.

[12] Tondini, "The Pope of Rome and the Popes of the Oriental Orthodox

The Archbishop of Mohilev was in reality a Prussianized official of the Holy Synod at St. Petersburg for the suppression of all religious liberty among Russian Catholics of either rite. The conquerors and oppressors of these populations knew too well how profoundly religious the latter were and how fierce would be their resistance to the "benevolent assimilation" contemplated, were they to be left in living contact with the Catholicism of Europe. Hence the cunning plan of cutting the nerve of unity and then overthrowing them at intervals and when occasion offered. Poland made an heroic resistance; the fate of the Uniats remains to be told. It is only when we look upon the pitiable internal condition of Russia that we understand the true significance of St. Anselm of Canterbury and St. Thomas à Becket and a hundred other men of the mediæval world who withstood the contemporary tyrant and suffered, that coming generations might not perish spiritually. The ignorance and apathy of the unhappy Russian peasantry are directly traceable to their clergy, whose only excuse is that they are yet the public serfs of the Russian State. On all sides are heard to-day the voices of Russian men and women demanding that an end be put to their horrible wrongs. Only the voices of the clergy are dumb. No Bishop speaks from his monastic retreat, and no village priest dare open his mouth were he fitted to do so. The monastic clergy despises the poor and brutalized secular clergy, and the latter pay back contempt with hatred. No Bishop dare consult with another Bishop, and in the episcopal committee that governs in minute detail the Russian Church the sole real power is the lay representative of the Czar. Were the alleged spiritual tyranny of Rome to be multiplied a hundredfold it would not equal that which for two centuries has been exercised immediately on every Russian, and for a still longer time has hampered the growth of all true religion. All the rich treasures that lie in the natural development of ecclesiastical personality, *i. e.*, independence of judgment, initiative, active sympathy, progress and development, are wasted. From beginning to end ecclesiastical life in Russia is a professional *carriera*, like that of a notary or a civil servant. "Would you have me

---

Church," London, 1871, and Gagarin, *op. cit. passim.* cf. also "Of the White and the Black Clergy of Russia," Leipzig, 1866 (Russian), for the details of the spiritual ruin of Russia. The reader may also consult "The Patriarch and the Tzar—Replies of the Humble Nicon by the Mercy of God, Patriarch of Moscow," London, 1871. That the condition of the Russian clergy under the State domination has not changed may be seen from many books of travel, particularly from Wallace's "Russia," London, 1881: c. IV. "The Village Priest," pp. 50-67, and c. XXVII., pp. 421-434. This writer is not unfavorable to Russia, and was afforded every facility during six years for the composition of his work. In more than one place he manifests a certain jealousy of Catholic ecclesiastical independence.

become like the Archbishop of Moscow or the Archbishop of Canterbury?" said Leo XIII. one day to a prominent Archbishop of the United States, apropos of his relations with the Italian Government. What surer commentary on the historical steps that reduced these ecclesiastics from their free and independent status to the rank of civil agents? In the wake of civil control of ecclesiastical life follow always ambition and corruption. Secularism of every kind invades the sanctuary.[13] The Gospel of Jesus and the examples of His saints are made vain or serve only the vices they openly condemn. Nepotism becomes an institution, and the civil and ecclesiastical prizes are placed on one level to be struggled for with an equal human ardor of rivalry. Thus the vanquished paganism of ancient life returns to power, the distinction of temporal and spiritual is lost or overlaid, and soon the multitudes envelop in a

[13] It may not be out of place to quote here the words of an estimable historian of the Tudor religious policy, that, *mutatis mutandis*, has been adopted by Russia since Peter the Great:

"Under Henry VIII. the true liberties and independence of the Church, as they had been set forth afresh by Magna Charta, were successfully destroyed. These fell with the fall of the monasteries and their inmates, and became extinct with the old and estimable race of Bishops and clergy. The iron will of a cruel despot, whom anger and covetousness alternately excited to action, with the Machiavellian policy of his selfish advisers, soon brought all this evil to pass. Parliaments and parliament-men, new nobles and pinchbeck knights of the shires were as abjectly subservient to the impetuous monarch as the judges themselves. Old laws were interpreted and new enactments were passed with little regard to aught else than the cruel king's shifting whims. Ofttimes, in the interpretation of such oppressive laws, every principle of truth and justice, of right and fair play was set at naught, so that under this royal house nothing less than the subversion of the ancient Constitution of England was successfully effected. The malign influence of these changes and such as these can be clearly traced, and are practically energizing still. The overthrow of lawful ecclesiastical authority, by denuding the Courts of Canterbury and York of their spiritual character (neither by any rational conception nor reasonable possibility being final courts), made those of a local character unrespected and inefficient; while some of these diocesan courts became at once, and have remained ever since the Tudor age, mere nests of corruption, and little else than sources of revenue to those who were appointed to farm them. The granting of licenses was a prolific and well-worked mine of ready money for their hungry officials. In this and in other changes evil principles were then deliberately scattered and rooted, and still live, while, even in the present generation, a fresh crop of rotten fruit may be expected to be picked up ere long. For the destruction of Church authority, a fair tree cut down, as it were, to its very roots, has alarmingly weakened that of the monarch and the magistrate, and tended directly to destroy all authority. An ancient nation consequently, which, with Christian traditions twelve centuries old, expects to be governed wisely and well without the fear of God or the regard of man, and so long only as a mere contract or understanding between governor and governed can be tolerated and made to work, will be very specially and unusually favored if it does not—which God avert!—sooner or later experience a severe fall and court a supreme disaster.—Frederick George Lee, "Edward VI.: Supreme Head," London, 1886, pp. 243-244.

common contempt the principles of Christianity and the lives of its representatives.

Siestrencewicz let pass a golden opportunity. Perhaps we ought to take into account that he was an ex-courtier, a not too sincere convert from Protestantism, and that he entered on his holy office *per fenestram*, and not by the open and honorable door of vocation. He betrayed every interest of the Roman Church, as though the dominant instinct in him were always that of his native Calvinism. He betrayed every interest of his Polish fatherland, for had he remained loyal to the cause of Catholicism he might have been a powerful intermediary between the patriots of Poland and their conquerors. The vain insurrections of 1831 and 1864 might through him have accomplished their purpose in a peaceful way instead of leaving their nation bleeding on the cross for a whole century. Above all he might have held up to the enslaved State clergy of Russia an example of ecclesiastical independence that would one day quicken them into the successful resistance of martyrdom. The attitude of the Archbishop of Mohilev is all the more inexcusable, as precisely in those years that noble sufferer Pius VII. was giving the world the example of a renewal of the spirit and temper of Martin I. and Gregory VII. Not the least of the trials of Pope Pius was the conduct of Siestrencewicz. If the Catholics of Ireland were ever tempted to grant the right of veto to the English Government on the occasion of Catholic Emancipation, the career of Siestrencewicz and its effect upon the hopes of Polish nationality might well have deterred them. The anti-Catholic advisers of Catharine—German, French and Slav—judged only too correctly when they pointed out Siestrencewicz as the proper man to fasten the yoke on the neck of Poland. For this purpose he was worth to Russia a million of men and countless treasure. He did more damage to Catholicism in Russia than a great heresiarch could have done. The latter would have roused devotion and purified the Church; the Archbishop of Mohilev stood in the pass and held back the vigorous resistance of that glorious nation which had been for so many centuries the bulwark of Europe against Islam. He also prepared the way for the crowning injustice of Russian policy in the nineteenth century—the destruction of the amity and concord that for centuries had existed between the Apostolic See and millions of Russian Catholics. It is he who is primarily responsible for their compulsory apostasy and inscription on the mendacious registers of schism. He was a true disciple of Photius and Michael Cærularius; there is scarcely an evil trait in the lives of these two bad men which he did not parallel—ambition, venality, hypocrisy, forgery, cant, and ecclesiastical treason too

frequent and manifold to relate. On the other hand, Russia has now begun to pay on the dearest scale for the luxury of such Byzantine rascality. Her legions, returning from the far Orient, decimated, humiliated, deceived, will be a ten-fold worse menace to the criminal autocracy than were those victorious veterans of Alexander I., who nearly wrecked the Russian State. There is no native esteem for ecclesiastical authority; the Russian Church seems a pale mitred simulacrum with an icon in one hand and a cross in the other, but without spirit or voice, without initiative, without historical pride, knowing herself only as a department of the imperial chancery, and destined to share its fate, perhaps its abolition. The makers of the New Russia will be moved by the logic of the situation to neglect a church that has become at once an *instrumentum regni* and a scourge of society. The new education will be conducted without her influence and her spirit, for they exist not. The new principles of government will be perforce borrowed from abroad. Russia will this time undergo a cosmopolitan pressure as she once was subservient to Berlin or Paris. Individual right and personal liberty must grow slowly where the urban population is so small compared with the vast masses of ignorant and debased peasantry. Her only chance will be to go to school again to Roman Catholic models and institutions as she did in the latter half of the seventeenth century. She will need again to appeal to the centre of religious life in the West in order to develop some vigor of spirit, some measure of independent life in the spiritual system that holds torpid and stagnant the hearts of her multitudes. Then will come true the vision that hung before the eyes of her dying Alexander, and will be repaired, though tardily, the villainy of the ecclesiastical tools whom she used to her own destruction.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Washington, D. C.

THE ANGLO-ROMAN CONTROVERSY.

I.

TWO recent facts have indirectly turned men's attention once again to the controversy between Catholics and Anglicans —the recent High Anglican appeal to the authority of the first six centuries and Bishop Gore's sixpenny reissue (unrevised) of his "Roman Catholic Claims." A word, therefore, on the subject may not seem unseasonable.

The point, and the whole point, at issue between the contending parties, we shall do well to remember, is wholly and solely the question of authority. Who is the Supreme Head of the Church?

Settle that, and all else follows. Leave that open, and nothing else is of much avail.

Moreover, the discussion is even more limited still. For in England the choice of Supreme Head lies between Pope and King. The Catholic Church acknowledges the Pope; the State Church, the King. Which is right?

In the second part of this paper I propose to draw out the fact that in the State Church it is the King. Here I offer some remarks on the Headship, in the Catholic Church, of the Pope.

Catholics hold the Pope to be Supreme Head of the Catholic Church. That is the unanimous teaching of the whole Catholic world. It was the teaching of our English ancestors from the sixth to the sixteenth century. It was the fundamental doctrine of the English statute law. It was the repeated teaching of the Greeks—a teaching not weakened by their lapses into schism.

The Catholic Church is one visible body throughout the world. A visible body must, *in the same order of life*, have a visible head. That Head is the Pope.

Dr. Gore (chap. ii.) if I understand him aright, would contend that the Church is an aggregation of national bodies—a sort of United States. But an aggregation must have a head. The United States have a President.

This Catholic doctrine is proved from Scripture. It is proved from history. It is proved from experience; for vast as the Catholic Church is and composed of such diverse elements, she nevertheless preserves unity; and she alone preserves unity.

This Papal claim Dr. Gore considers to be an "aggressive," "domineering," "arbitrary," "intolerance" (pp. 95-96). Nay, to make the claim at all is "to become saturated with a spirit of unfaithfulness to historical fact" (p. 13). And he thinks that it was not until "towards the end of the second century that we begin to discern dimly the first beginnings of the claim (on the part of the Popes) to be successors of S. Peter" (p. 95).

"Towards the end of the second century!" Well, that is pretty early! And Christ, we are asked to believe, to correct this lawless state of things, waited fourteen centuries, from the second to the sixteenth, until the coming of Henry VIII., Crumwel and Cranmer! That, surely, is to put a heavy tax on our powers of credulity. What, however, was only "dimly discerned" in the second became plain as a pike-staff in the fifth century. For by that time the whole Christian world unmistakably held to the Papal form of Christianity, the Patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch and Constantinople all recognizing an episcopate equal in order under the Headship of St. Peter's successor, the Pope.

"But," the opponent asks triumphantly, "where during the second century were your Papal Bulls, Papal Encyclicals, Papal Legates, Papal interference in the spiritual affairs of Christendom? That question we answer by asking another: "Where were the Popes themselves?" The answer is obvious. They were in the Catacombs, hiding in sandholes amid a handful of Christians, biding their time until some spy of the Cæsars should hale them into light and to the scaffold. The first thirty Popes were martyrs. That is why, from the Chancellery of the Catacombs, the Popes did not expedite Bulls and Briefs by the couriers of Nero and Trajan, of Decius and Marcus Aurelius.

Still, even in those early days, we are not entirely without evidence for Papal Headship. "We begin dimly to discern towards the end of the second century" the Papal claim to supremacy. May I point out to Dr. Gore that he errs by just a century. We discern that claim, though not "dimly," at the end, not of the second, but of the first century. That claim was made and allowed seven years before the close of the first century—in the year 93,[1] on the occasion of the "Prima Clementis," the first letter of St. Clement, third Pope after St. Peter. Its history is well known.

In the Church at Corinth a small but powerful party rose in rebellion against their spiritual superiors, with the result that some priests were thrust forth from their positions. The schism created such a stir that even the pagans took occasion of it to calumniate the Christian religion. The situation was critical. The Corinthian Church was itself unable to apply a remedy, and therefore the reigning Pope, St. Clement, lifted up his voice to defend the great principle of unity against the spirit of revolt and schism. He wrote to the Corinthians, "confirming them in peace, and renewing their faith and doctrine lately received from the apostle."[2] In a tone of commanding authority he said: "If any disobey *the words of God spoken through us*, let them know that they will entangle themselves in transgression." And again: "You will cause us joy and exultation if, *obeying the things written by us through the Spirit*, you cut out the lawless passion," etc. Note the expression, "the words of God spoken through us" and "the things written by us through the Spirit." Those phrases read very much like the modern Papal formula, "It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us."

Of this letter Mr. Cruttwell[3] writes: "The tone of Clement's language is distinctly that of a superior offering counsel, exhortation

[1] Cf. Harnack, "Altch. Lit.," Pt. II., Vol. I. "Chronologische Tabelle," p. 718.

[2] Eusebius H. E. v. 6.

[3] "A Literary History of Early Christianity," by C. T. Cruttwell, rector of Kribworth, Vol. I., p. 32.

and reproof. The Christian Church of the capital of the world seems to have acknowledged *from the first* a more than local responsibility. This fact gives our epistle a high historical interest as the earliest and, as it were, spontaneous exponent of this consciousness of preëminence."

Clement's letter was reverenced by antiquity only less than the Scriptures themselves. It was bound up with the Scriptures. It was publicly read in the churches with the Scriptures. Eusebius[4] calls it "a great and wonderful letter," and informs us that it was "universally received by all" and that "both in former times, even the earliest, down to our own day (A. D. 325) it was, for the common benefit, publicly read in most of the churches." Irenæus (c. 170) called it "a most powerful epistle."[5]

Now, we may well ask, why this interference of Rome in the affairs of Corinth? At the beginning of Christianity, Dr. Gore would have us believe, all churches were on the same footing of equality. If Rome interferes later in the affairs of others she is "aggressive, domineering, arbitrary and intolerant;" but her interference in the first centuries presents itself to the Anglican Bishop of Birmingham in no such light. Why not? Because his case requires that he should, at all costs, prove that the Roman Bishop had usurped in the later centuries an authority which he did not possess in the earlier. The intrusion, however, of Clement into the internal affairs of the Corinthian Church calls for a clear explanation. By what right did he assume the tone of a superior and despatch a formal letter a long journey across seas to interfere, unsolicited,[6] in the private affairs of an alien Church? And why did that proud and turbulent Church tolerate Clement's assumption of authority? Nay, why did that Church from the day on which Clement's letter was received[7] bind up that letter with the canonical Scriptures and read it, Sunday by Sunday, as being of only less authority than the Bible itself? The Corinthians were a proud people; if, then, it was necessary to correct them, why was not the reproof administered by Christians of their own blood; by one of the neighboring and flourishing Churches, let us say, of Thessalonica, or Philippi, or Berea? Or, if the reproof was to come from beyond the soil of Greece, why not from that cradle of the Christian faith hard by, Asia Minor; from those elder sisters of theirs, the famous Churches of Smyrna and of Ephesus?

[4] H. E. III., 16, 38; IV., 23; V., 6.

[5] ἱκανωτάτην γραφήν. "Adv. Haer," III., c. 3, 3.

[6] Freppel, "Les Pères Apostoliques," third ed., p. 136, here falls into the error of supposing that the Corinthians had, of their own accord, appealed for guidance to the Pope. That was not the case. Cf. Funk, "Patres Apostol, I., p. 60, note on παρ' ὑμῖν First Clementis, I., 1.

[7] Lightfoot, "Apost. Fathers," Plate I., p. 369.

Nor is this, by any means, the whole case. There remains another and a much stronger reason still, for close at hand, at Ephesus, was St. John, the Beloved Disciple, Apostle and Evangelist, on whom were centred the love and respect of all Christendom. Why did not the needful reproof come from St. John, nigh at hand, rather than from that far-off Bishop of Rome, hiding in the Catacombs? The answer seems obvious. The Pope, as successor of S. Peter, was—and St. John was not—the Head of Christendom.

On this letter Dr. Gore has but lightly touched. This weighty evidence he has not set forth. He has not even suggested it. Nor does he attempt seriously to refute it. He writes as if the letter were no difficulty at all for his cause, and tells us that the claim to Papal supremacy is only "dimly discerned towards the end of the second century"—just one hundred years after Clement's time!

This famous letter is, however, so early and so strikingly a proof of Papal supremacy that it used to be the fashion for Protestants to assail its authenticity. Mosheim, Neander, the Tubingen School and especially Baur, Ammon, Schwegler and others, did their best in this direction, but with the to them unexpected and unwished for result that now no respectable scholar agrees with them, and the controversy is practically closed.

Again, present-day opponents, including Lightfoot, contend that, though the letter is authentic, it is the missive not of Clement at all, but of the Roman Church. On this point Dr. Gore writes with a fairness that does him honor that though in the letter "the tone of authority may be due to the prestige of the Church at Rome, it seems more likely that, while the letter is written in the name of that Church, the authority is mainly St. Clement's" (p. 94).[8] And the Bishop is obviously right, for he has the whole of antiquity on his side.[9] It is only a question of epistolary style, and the absence of Clement's name at the head of the letter no more implies that it was not his than our modern "Dear Sir" implies that the correspondent is really "dear." It would be absurd to expect in the first century the style of the Roman Chancellery of the twentieth. These collective titles were the early fashion. For instance, St. Paul writes the First Epistle to the Corinthians in the name of himself and "Sosthenes our brother;" the Second, of himself and "our

[8] I note, too, that Dr. Gore gives up the well-worn Protestant argument that St. Peter was never in Rome (p. 93). Nor has he ever so much as a reference to that other hoary argument, which has served so many generations of controversialists, that "Petros" means not "rock," but "a stone," p. 76. This is progress!

[9] Cf. Funk ("Opera Patrum Apostolicorum," Tubingae, 1881, Vol. I., p. 17), who discusses the question at length and sums up his conclusion thus: "Clementem eam exarasse vix dubium est, quum veteres ad unum omnes de hac re consentiant."

brother Timothy;" the Epistle to the Galatians, of himself and "all the brethren who are with me." But St. Paul was not, thereby, sharing his apostolic authority, especially with lay folk. A letter written collectively by many does not exclude the hierarchical distinction.

Again, Dr. Gore thinks that the commanding position of the Roman Church on this and other occasions was due "to the early munificence of her almsgiving" (p. 94). A curious plea indeed! But has not His Lordship mistaken effect for cause? The Roman Pontiff was not supreme because he gave alms, but he gave alms because he was supreme. He had the care of "all the churches." He was always Pope, that is "father," and the faithful everywhere were always his "children." His almsgiving was for the support of children by their father. This is distinctly affirmed by Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth: "For this practice has prevailed with you *from the beginning*, to do good to all the brethren in every way, and to send contributions to many churches, in every city . . . which custom was not only observed by your Bishop Soter (Pope, A. D. 168), but also increased, as he not only furnished great supplies to the saints, but also encouraged the brethren that came from abroad, *as a loving father his children.*"[10] A custom that still survives!

I am not here proving Papal supremacy from patristic evidence. That task would need a volume. But I am pointing out that the Anglican Bishop of Birmingham in "beginning, towards the end of the second century, dimly to discern the first beginnings of the Popes' claim to be successors of S. Peter," has strangely failed to discern that same fact, not "dimly," but clearly, towards the end of the first. I may, however, be allowed to remind Dr. Gore that by denying the earlier evidence for Papal Headship he is committing himself to an indefensible position. For he is thereby asking Anglicans to believe that there can be an effect without a cause, a tree without roots, lofty edifice without foundations. When the era of persecution ceased the Pope came forth supreme. The supremacy of the Pope when he emerged from the Catacombs was as obvious as the sun is obvious when it emerges from behind clouds that have long obscured its face. From the Catacombs the Pope came forth to define dogma, to regulate discipline, to preside at Councils, to despatch legates from West to East. He claimed to be everywhere supreme; he exercised that claim, and as no one protested, no one wondered. How, then, could there be this "towering edifice of Papal pretensions"—as Mr. Cruttwell calls it—unless the foundations had been long, slowly and carefully laid? How could there be this great tree with ample branches, strong and erect, con-

[10] Eusebius, H. E. IV., 23.

fronting all the gales of opposition, unless its roots had been, for long, shooting deep and wide into the earth? The era of persecution over, the Popes could claim and exercise supremacy, in the most striking fashion, and yet Gaul, Africa, Asia Minor, Greece and all other parts of the Christian world quietly recognized a power which—Anglicans would have us believe—had been born but yesterday and had a basis neither of right nor title. The Churches of Jerusalem, Antioch and Alexandria—as old as the Church of Rome itself—why did they admit this Headship? In other respects they were determined sticklers for their rights; then why did they not kick against the goad here? How came the yoke to be fastened so easily on their necks? The Anglican explanation makes their submission unintelligible. Indeed the more controversialists restrict the Pope's exercise of authority in the three first centuries, the more inexplicable do they render his world-wide exercise of that power in the centuries that follow.

In the darkness of the first ages we have but occasional glimpses of the laying of the foundations and the growth of the sapling, but in the fourth century the towering edifice and the mighty tree were undeniably there, and therefore we know for certain that the foundations of the one had long before been solidly laid, and that the roots of the other had early shot deep into the ground.

Dr. Gore (p. 13) writes of us Catholics thus: "We have ceased almost to hope to find in a modern Roman writer a candid review of the whole facts of a case where the Roman claims are in question. Candor, an attempt to fairly produce the whole case, a love of the whole truth—this seems to have vanished from their literature and its place is taken by an abundant skill in making the best of all that looks Romewards in church history, and ignoring the rest. . . . The Roman Church is disqualified from dealing broadly and frankly with facts."

Severe censure indeed; yet in face of our critic's own treatment of the "Prima Clementis" we may perhaps bear the blame with equanimity!

II.

We have already pointed out that the fundamental question at issue between Catholics and Anglicans is this, whether Pope or King be Spiritual Head of the Church. But that the English Sovereign is Supreme Head of the English State Church it is the purpose of this paper to recall to mind.

When the English Parliament established the territorial Church theory of "*Sic vexillum, sic religio*," and abolished—in England, Calais and the French Marches—the Spiritual Headship of the Pope

and thereby passed into schism, it substituted in its stead the Spiritual Headship of the Sovereign, and thereby passed into heresy. It is of prime importance to bear in mind that supremacy was not taken from the Pope and without breach of Catholic unity given to the English Church so that she thereby became autocephalous, but was taken from the Pope and transferred whole and entire to the Crown. The Pope had been for a thousand years, the Crown became, the Supreme Head in spirituals of the English Church. Nor was this done under protest from the Church. On the contrary, this transference of supreme spiritual functions from Pope to King, the Church of England herself ratified and accepted; she herself, with her own hands, fitted the yoke on to her own neck, and proclaimed herself to be "established by law." These facts are writ large on the face of the Statute Law of this realm, as a casual reader may see for himself by a glance at that admirable booklet, "The Reformation Settlement."[11]

Take a few instances of this transference. The Act 24 Hen. 8, c. 12 recites that this Realm of England is an Empire governed by one Supreme Head and King, to whom a body politic, of spirituality and temporality, owes, next to God, obedience. And enacts that all causes relating to spiritual jurisdiction shall be determined within the King's jurisdiction.

Consequently the King, *i. e.*, Parliament, or in practice, the Privy Council, is for the State Church the Ecclesiastical Court of Final Appeal. Thus 25 Hen. 8, c. 19, sec. 4 provides that appeals shall lie from the Archbishop's Court to the King's Court of Chancery; and then, upon such an appeal, a commission shall be directed, under the great seal, to hear and determine such appeals; *and such judgment shall be final and without appeal.*

The Act 25 Hen. 8, c. 21 repeats that this Realm recognizes no superior under God but the King; and the King and Parliament have power to dispense from and make new laws *in all matters.*

The position is stated with admirable clearness in 26 Hen. 8, c. 1: The King, our Sovereign Lord, his heirs and successors, shall be taken, accepted and reputed the only Supreme Head on earth of the Church of England called *Anglicana Ecclesia*, and shall have and enjoy, annexed and united to the Imperial Crown of this realm, as well the title and style thereof, as all honours, dignities, preëminences, jurisdictions, privileges and profits to the said dignity of Supreme Head of the said Church belonging. And that our said Sovereign Lord, his heirs and successors, Kings of this Realm, shall

[11] "An Epitome of the Statute and Canon Law Thereon," by F. McMullan and Guy Ellis, Sands & Co., 1-6. This work no teacher of English history should be without.

have full power and authority to visit, reform and amend all such errors, heresies and abuses which by any spiritual authority or jurisdiction may be reformed, repressed or amended.

Then with logical frankness the King proceeds to act on the powers thus granted him and appoints a layman as Supreme Vicegerent. The Act 31 Hen. 8, c. 10 recites that as the King's Majesty is Supreme Head in earth, under God, of the Church of England, he hath made Thomas Lord Crumwel his Vicegerent, in all cases and causes touching the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and for the godly reformation and redress of all errors, heresies and abuses in the said Church. And enacts that the said Vicegerent, and all persons hereafter taking the said office, shall sit in all Parliaments on the same form as the Archbishop of Canterbury sitteth, and ABOVE the said Archbishop and his successors.

Act 31 Hen. 8, c. 14 advances another step and recites that the King is, *by God's law*, Supreme Head of the Church of England.

That the Papal jurisdiction was transferred to the Crown, and not to the State Church, is repeated in 37 Hen. 8, c. 17, which recites that the usurped power of the Bishop of Rome is directly repugnant to the King's Majesty as Supreme Head of the Church; that *the clergy have no ecclesiastical jurisdiction but by and under the King, who is the only Supreme Head of the Church of England, to whom all authority and power is wholly given to hear and determine all causes ecclesiastical.*"[12]

This is the Act which placed Diocesan Chancellors above their Bishops.

The Act 1 and 2 Philip and Mary, c. 8 abolished the title of Supreme Head.

The Act 1 Eliz., c. 1 repealed all the legislation of the previous reign for the restoration of the Catholic religion and reënacted the Protestant legislation of Henry and Edward. The Act does not expressly restore the title of "Supreme Head of the Church," but changes it into "Supreme Governor in Spiritual and Ecclesiastical things." It is, however, a distinction without a difference, for the Act annexes to the Crown all spiritual and ecclesiastical jurisdiction (secs. 16 and 17) and (sec. 18) empowers the Queen and her successors to appoint commissioners to exercise their spiritual and ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

Bishop Gibson's Codex summarizes this Act thus: "*Supreme Head of the Church of England, Papal and Regal. Such spiritual*

[12] Dr. Gore (p. 62) says: "The Bible is the ultimate record of the faith." Yes, but the Bible interpreted by whom? The Bishop answers: "The Church is the interpreter." Yes, but who is this Church? The English law answers: "The King."

jurisdiction as hath heretofore been exercised shall be forever annexed to the Crown!"

Thus were schism and heresy forced on the English people; first by bribing the upper classes with Church lands which amounted to a third of the land of England; secondly, by repeated Acts which made it high treason to refuse to forswear the Papal authority.[13] To teach anything contrary to the King's instructions was punished by burning.[14]

This position the English Church fully accepted. By Act 1 Eliz., c. 1, s. 19 all Archbishops, Bishops and others swore as follows:

"I, A. B., testify and declare, in my conscience, that the Queen's Highness is the only Supreme Governor of this realm, as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things as temporal; and that no foreign prince, prelate or potentate hath, or ought to have, any jurisdiction, superiority or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm," etc.

Up to 1865 this oath, and a later modification of it, made impossible the belief in the Pope as "Patriarch of the West;" or as having a "Primacy of Honor;" or any other such like modifications of the ancient belief of Christendom.[15]

In the "Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical of 1603" the State Church decreed that *"the King's supremacy over the Church of England in causes ecclesiastical is to be maintained"* (Can. I.); and (Can. II.) she officially styled herself *"the Church of England, by law established, under the King's Majesty."*

By law, then, the English Sovereign, King or Queen, or, in other words, the English Parliament, and in large measure the Prime Minister—not necessarily of any religion—is the Supreme Head of the Anglican Church. The Privy Council is the *Cathedra Petri* of Anglicanism. And this not in name merely, but in effect. For instance, in February, 1850, in the case of Gorham *vs.* the Bishop of Exeter, the Supreme Head decided against the Bishop that a beneficed clergyman of the Church of England might deny the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. That decision the English Church cannot and has made no attempt to repudiate. And the result is that one Anglican minister, with nearly all the instincts of a Catholic priest, may be compelled to discharge his functions side by side with another Anglican minister who is not even a Christian. An unbaptized person is, in the State Church, competent to hold the highest preferments—even the Archbishopric of Canterbury; so that if any agnostic Prime Minister chose to nominate such a one by a Letter

[13] V. g. 28 Hen. 8, c. 10; I. Edw. 6, c. 12; I. Eliz., c. 1.
[14] 34 and 35 Hen. 8, c. 1.
[15] McMullan and Ellis, p. 43.

Missive "the dean and chapter shall with all convenient celerity elect and choose the same and none other; and in default of such election the King shall nominate and present the Archbishop by Letters Patent" (25 Hen. 8, c. 20, s. 4).

Lately, when an influential deputation waited on the Archbishop of Canterbury and proposed to make the first six centuries a rule of faith, the Primate, knowing the law, declared his inability to do more than sympathize with them, and referred them to the Royal Commission; that is, to the Supreme Head, or the Supreme Governor, if the latter term be preferred.

Dr. Gore has, in his "Roman Catholic Claims," a chapter on "Anglican Orthodoxy," in which he eloquently defends the partial orthodoxy not of the State Church, but of that particular party in the State Church of which His Lordship is so conspicuous an ornament. But are we wrong in supposing that an Anglican may believe as much or as little as he thinks fit, and as his own particular judgment recommends? We have Anglicans who admit all Catholic doctrine, even the supremacy of the Holy See. We have, or had lately, an Anglican minister who publicly taught—or used language such that he was understood publicly to teach—that God is not even a person, but a blind force. At the time of the publication of "Essays and Reviews" a document was drawn up by convocation in which there appeared a list of doctrines denied—so the document asserted—by the writers of that famous work. To this appeal the Supreme Judge, or "Supreme Governor in spiritual and ecclesiastical things," to wit, the Privy Council, decided that the book in question, setting forth these denials, contained nothing contrary to the articles and formularies of the Church of England, and thus did not deserve censure.[16] Dr. Gore in his little book is careful himself to deny a certain number of Catholic doctrines, and thereby is exercising, like the writers of "Essays and Reviews," his own private judgment. It is true that in him the exercise of that faculty does not carry him by any means so far as it carried them; nevertheless, both parties act on precisely the same principle. The list of doctrines which those writers denied, and the denial of which the Supreme Governor declared not to deserve censure, is as follows:

1. The verity of miracles, including the idea of creation presented to us by the Bible.
2. Predictive prophecy, especially predictions concerning the incarnation, person and offices of our Lord.
3. The descent of all men from Adam.
4. The fall of man and original sin.
5. The divine command to sacrifice Isaac.

[16] Cf. "The Crown in Council on 'Essays and Reviews,'" by Manning.

6. The incarnation of our Lord.
7. Salvation through the blood of Christ.
8. The personality of the Holy Spirit.
9. Special and supernatural inspiration.

To this catalogue if we add—what is of every day occurrence in the State Church, and even among the ministers—the denial of baptism, the real presence and eternal punishment, we have evidence on which to base a sound opinion as to what Anglican orthodoxy may be.

Nor is this a merely passing phase. The evil is rooted in the very nature of the State Church. As Papal supremacy is a principle of union, so royal supremacy, alias private judgment, is a principle of disunion. The one force is centripetal, the other centrifugal.

Then in what sense is the State Church "Catholic?" For the Catholic Church is the "pillar and ground of the truth."

If ever we are to have reunion, the path trodden at the Reformation will have to be retraced. Then ecclesiastical supremacy was, by legal forms, transferred from Pope to King. Reunion will require the re-transferrence of the same from King to Pope.

Dr. Gore pleads with all his eloquence against the supremacy of the Roman Sovereign. But in his argumentation there is nothing that is new. If the English Church is ever again to become Catholic, it must again become Roman. The Anglican Bishop of Birmingham's anti-Catholic booklet was, by anticipation, answered three centuries ago by two men as devout, as earnest, as learned and as acute as himself, and who sealed their belief with their blood.

Blessed John Fisher, Cardinal Bishop of Rochester, said to his venal judges: "My Lords, I am here condemned before you of high treason for denial of the King's supremacy over the Church of England, but by what order of justice I leave to God, who is the searcher both of the King, His Majesty's conscience and yours; nevertheless, being found guilty, as it is termed, I am and must be contented with all that God shall send, to whose will I wholly refer and submit myself. And now, to tell you more plainly my mind, touching this matter of the King's supremacy, I think indeed, and have always thought, and do now loudly affirm, that His Grace cannot justly claim any such supremacy over the Church of God as he now taketh upon him."

That was the faith of Catholic England and of Christendom. Hence, in his dying speech, Blessed Fisher said: "Christian people, I am come hither to die for the faith of Christ's holy Catholic Church."

And blessed Thomas More, Lord Chancellor of England, said: "I have, by the grace of God, been always a Catholic, never out of

communion with the Roman Pontiff; but I had heard it said at times that the authority of the Roman Pontiff was certainly lawful and to be respected, but still an authority derived from human law, and not standing on a divine prescription. Then when I observed that public affairs were so ordered that the sources of the power of the Roman Pontiff would necessarily be examined, I gave myself up to a most diligent examination of that question for the space of seven years, and found that the authority of the Roman Pontiff which you rashly—I will not use stronger language—have set aside is not only lawful, to be respected and necessary, but also grounded on the divine law and prescription. That is my opinion. That is the belief in which, by the grace of God, I shall die."

For St. Peter's primacy, carried on by his successors, we have Scriptural authority, Patristic authority, Conciliar authority. But for the royal primacy what authority is there—Scriptural, Patristic or Conciliar?

He assuredly assumes a grave responsibility who uses pen and position to keep people from the Catholic Church and the sacraments by "rashly—I will not use stronger language—setting aside the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff, which is lawful, to be respected, necessary, grounded on prescription and divine law."

It is for the Church to teach the individual, not the individual the Church.

CHARLES COUPE, S. J.

London, England.

THE EVOLUTION OF OUR ENGLISH BIBLE.

THE only authorized, in the sense of official Bible of the Catholic Church, is the Vulgate.[1] The historic Church is conservative of its ancient language, and it was inevitable that the authoritative form of the Scriptures for the Universal Church should be a Latin version. Whatever local authorization vernacular Bibles enjoy depends primarily on their being faithful renderings of the Vulgate—except in some inconsiderable Oriental sections of the Church. And so we cannot understand what our English version of to-day is unless we first acquaint ourselves, however cursorily, with the history and character of the Vulgate.

In studying the history of any translation of Sacred Scripture,

[1] The name is very ancient. The Vulgate's predecessor was called the *editio vulgata, i. e.*, the vulgar or popular version; and St. Jerome's translation, in taking its place, inherited its name.

the question of the purity of its underlying text is of capital importance. A version, of course, will not attain its desired end unless it renders the original with at least substantial fidelity; but it is obviously paramount that this original should not be vitiated by textual corruptions, and no amount of linguistic or literary skill will overcome the radical fault of building upon a false or precarious foundation. The first essential of a good translation of Holy Writ is that its original text should, as far as possible, agree with the primitive inspired one. Hence the prominence this essay will give to everything bearing on the integrity and preservation of the basis, immediate and ultimate, of our sacred versions; matters which would be dry and tedious were it not that they concern so closely the value of those forms of the written Word which the Church and ecclesiastical authorities have placed in our hands.

THE MAKING OF THE VULGATE.

This venerable version is inseparably linked with a great and striking personality—a figure unique in Christian antiquity. The story of the making of the Vulgate is the story of Saint Jerome.

Eusebius Hieronymus—to give him once his full Latin name—was born of well-to-do Christian parents at Stridon, a town of semi-barbarous Dalmatia (now in Austria), and in the year of grace 342. He was sent to acquire a polite education at Rome; and the youth of eighteen was not proof against the allurements of the still half-pagan capital. Fortunately for himself and the world, to an ardent temperament Jerome joined an eager and able mind, and his passion for books and learning was a potent auxiliary to his better instincts in the struggle for the mastery. A youth who spent hours in toilsome copying to add another treasure to his parchment library could never become a vulgar profligate. The highest things appealed to him through the higher, and on a visit to Gaul he resolved to renounce the pleasures of the world. Hitherto only a catechumen, for fear of failing to keep the lofty standard required of the baptized Christian, Jerome at the age of twenty-four had himself christened by Pope Liberius at Rome. Yet his moral struggles were by no means over. Long after, the memory of his Roman pleasures haunted him as temptations; and all through his life he warred against an irascible and caustic temper, and overbearing impatience of opposition.

Space forbids us to follow the details of Jerome's career. He imbibed sacred knowledge and first fell under the influence of monastic discipline at Aquileia, in his native province. But his imperious and somewhat acrid temperament lost him friends, and

weary of embitterment and strife, the student turned his eyes toward the East, hoping to forget his heartburnings in the sweet calm of the holy places.

He went in company with a few friends, encumbering the long overland journey with his inseparable books. Jerusalem was the original goal, but illness and other circumstances detained him in Syria.[2] As he desired an anchorite's life in the desert, his stay at Antioch was short. He buried himself for five years in the sandy waste of the Syrian desert. But the fiery blood of youth and memories of his libertine days harassed him with dreadful temptations, and it was only by the most anguished efforts that he overcame himself. He chastened his body by rigorous penances, and to these, beside imploring prayers, he added a novel discipline—the study of Hebrew.[3] It was a converted Jew, a monk, who initiated Jerome in the mysteries of the language of the Old Testament—a language for which he never entirely overcame his initial repugnance. At the end of his solitude the saint was induced to take priest's orders at Antioch, on condition that he was to be unencumbered by a charge. We find him spending a while at Constantinople as a disciple of its Bishop, Saint Gregory of Nazianzen, in Sacred Scripture, then the dominant theological study, and already Jerome's passion.

Thence he returned to Rome at the call of Pope Damasus, who had been impressed by Jerome's learning and orthodoxy, through a correspondence, and wished the benefit of his counsel at an approaching synod.[4] Damasus soon recognized Jerome's vigor and ability. The Pontiff had not been long in personal intercourse with the latter when he chose him as his secretary and entrusted to him a flattering but difficult task. This was no less than a revision of the current Latin version of the New Testament and Psalter.[5]

The Old Latin Bible, of which these were parts, is not without interest to us, since it was the first translation into a Western tongue, and formed the basis of St. Jerome's revision, which still exists in the New Testament and Psalms of the Vulgate. Its origin is lost in obscurity. Scholars are generally agreed that there were a number of independent versions of the Greek Bible in the very first centuries of the Church. But whatever may have been the beginnings and diversities of the Old Latin, it is certain that a particular recension of it had been in use in Italy many years before Jerome's time, and had acquired a quasi-official authority as a text.

[2] Letter 30, to Eustochium.

[3] Letter 125, to Rusticus.

[4] Letter 52, to Nepotianus; Commentary on Ephesians v., 32.

[5] Preface to the Gospels; dedicated to Damasus.

The Italian Old Latin was a superior type of that manifold version, having been revised at least once upon the Greek.[6] But amateur correctors had since wrought such confusion that its theoretic unity was dispersed into actual multiplicity, and St. Jerome could complain of it: "Among the Latins there are as many different Bibles as copies."[7]

It was to bring order out of this confusion and create a standard text that Jerome addressed himself at the request of Damasus. The Gospels naturally came first. As the basis of his revision he carefully chose from a multitude of varying copies a few of the least adulterated and approaching most nearly to the text in the original language.[8] All was executed with careful comparison with the Greek, and here again Jerome exercised discrimination in selecting among the Greek manuscripts.[9] We have reason to think that the Greek text to which he gave the preference was better and older than those underlying the version he had in hand. In fact, the New Testament of St. Jerome has endless points of agreement with the oldest and most esteemed Greek manuscripts extant, and readings which are an improvement on the Old Latin must have been introduced by Jerome, if not also by the previous revisers.[10]

What is to be thought of the critical merits of the New Testament text as it issued from the saintly doctor's revision? The field of New Testament textual criticism is a peculiarly tangled and thorny one. Our extant Greek manuscripts—the very oldest of which are not older than the century of Jerome's revision—vary from each other in many little points, in some of greater consequence, and in a few of considerable length. The Greek text translated by the King James Version differs in thousands of details from that which the Revised Protestant stands for, while the Vulgate, in great part, combines elements of both; in lesser, it agrees with neither. Where lies the purest text? Neither the sacred autographs nor authentic copies of them have survived. Criticism is yet far from such a finality of results as to point with a sure finger to that type of the New Testament approaching most nearly the inspired autographs.

[6] Cf. Hort's and Westcott's "The New Testament in the Original Greek;" Introduction, pp. 78-79.

[7] Preface to Joshua.

[8] Preface to the Revision of the Gospels: "You (Damasus) oblige me to make a new work out of the old, so that I sit like a judge among the copies of Scripture scattered over the world, and since they vary from one another, determine which of them agree with the Greek truth."

[9] "We have been in such manner cautious in the emendation (of the Gospels) by a comparison of Greek codices—that is, old ones not differing much from the Latin reading—that we have corrected only those things that seemed to change the sense, leaving the rest stand." Preface to the Gospels.

[10] See the appendix to Wordsworth's and White's edition of the Vulgate New Testament, pp. 660 ff.

But what criticism fails to give, we Catholics get in sufficient measure from authority. When the Council of Trent defined that the Scriptures, as they were from time immemorial read in the Vulgate, are sacred and canonical, *cum omnibus suis partibus*, it set the seal of the Church infallible on the genuineness of two greatly disputed passages: the woman taken in adultery, St. John vii., 53; viii., 11, and the ending of St. Mark's Gospel, xvi., 9-20. The same unerring pronouncement affords us the precious certainty that *no* portion of the Vulgate of considerable length or vital importance can rightly lie under suspicion.

Jerome put a restraint upon his work, keeping it strictly within the limits of an emendation.[11] He studiously avoided all unnecessary changes in the diction, mindful how the faithful folk jealously conserved traditional forms in matters religious. Hence the Latinity of the Vulgate is that of the older version, the language not of Cicero and Horace, but of the *plebs* of the early centuries. This vulgar language was, however, enriched by many new words, taken mostly from the Septuagint, conveying spiritual and abstract ideas, and it was ennobled and consecrated by its adoption into the Bible of the Church. The Old Latin had sprung from the demand of the common people unversed in Greek, and was primarily intended for their use.

The work was completed in about a year. Damasus, it seems, had died meantime, and Jerome, deprived of his friend, was anxious to be quit of his task and wind up his affairs in Rome. Therefore while the Gospels are carefully revised, the work on the rest of the New Testament is of a somewhat inferior quality, but on the whole the result was a successful and adequate rendition of the originals. A correction of the Psalter followed the New Testament, but Jerome was dissatisfied with this as hasty, and ten years later, in Palestine, brought out another revision of the Psalms.[12] This got the name *Psalterium Gallicanum* in distinction to the older edition, the *Psalterium Romanum*, and it is still the official Psalter of the Church. Jerome's later version direct from the Hebrew never found its way into the sacred offices, presumably from the difficulty of substituting a new translation for the familiar words of the old in the liturgical chant, in which the people then took part. Favored by the influence—perhaps the authority—of Damasus and its own merits, our saint's correction of the New Testament was not long in finding general acceptance, not indeed without much conservative outcry. But the practical Western genius which excluded the Psalter translated from the Hebrew, on account of liturgical diffi-

[11] See note 9 above.

[12] Preface to the Psalms.

culties, in this case was not without its disadvantages, for despite the saintly doctor's double revision, the Psalter of the Vulgate and Roman breviary has the defects inseparable from the translation of a translation.

Pope Damasus probably did not live to see the New Testament revision completed, and Jerome, deprived of his powerful friend and patron and involved in acrimonious disputes with enemies which his austere and fiery zeal had made in Rome, again turned his thoughts towards the East. He had gathered about him a group of devoted disciples, mostly high-born ladies, whom he had imbued with his own ardor in the study of the inspired Word. Of these Paula, a wealthy widow, and her daughters, Eustochium and Blesilla, are closely linked with his subsequent career. They resolved to follow their spiritual father and master to the Holy Land, for thither was Jerome bent, and there he wished to remain until life's close.

After at length reaching Bethlehem, which was his chosen home, he established himself in a hut or cave and returned to the coarse garb, the rude fare and the ascetic life of an anchorite. The first years at Bethlehem (circa 385-394) make the golden time of Jerome's life—years of idyllic Christian peace in that hallowed and serene atmosphere. In this congenial environment the saintly recluse again took up his Biblical studies with redoubled fervor. He perfected himself in Hebrew and the knowledge of the Hebrew text by means of a friendly Israelite who for fear of his brethren's displeasure came to the anchorite's cell only at night, "like another Nicodemus," to use Jerome's phrase.[13] With what heroic effort he also mastered Aramaic, the language of parts of Daniel and Esdras, he has left us a graphic description.[14] We cannot but admire the indomitable energy with which he overcame the then formidable obstacles to the knowledge of the original texts, for it was long before the age of Oriental grammars and lexicons, and Hebrew manuscripts at that time exhibited a blind array of strange-looking consonants without a sign to represent the needful vowels, which were transmitted only by word of mouth.

Jerome had begun and carried to a conclusion the revision of the Old Testament already referred to.[15] But he excepted from this correction the books of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch and the Machabees, probably also Tobias and Judith.[16] This task brought more clearly to his view the defects of the Old Latin version of the

[13] Letter 84, 65.
[14] Preface to Daniel.
[15] Against Rufinus, Book II., 24.
[16] See Jerome's prefaces to the Books of Solomon and Jeremias.

Septuagint,[17] and the discrepancies between the Greek itself and the Hebrew text. He saw that only a version direct from the Hebrew could do desirable justice to the inspired originals, and he resolved to begin such a translation. The saint had imbibed from his Jewish teachers an overweening esteem for the current Hebrew edition, the *Hebraica veritas*, as he loved to call it. He seems to have been convinced that it was the primitive text, in its purity. Yet on the whole his preference for it over the Septuagint was right. Only by extricating the original Hebrew of the Greek Bible could Jerome have possibly secured a fundamental text superior to his Hebrew copy—an extremely difficult achievement, and one which modern criticism, with all its advantages, is not yet ready to compass.

But St. Jerome's main motive in undertaking a new translation from the Hebrew rose higher than reasons of literary and philological criticism. He had been grieved at the helplessness of Christian apologists in opposing the Jews when the former would cite a passage according to the Septuagint, only to be scornfully told that it was wanting in the Hebrew original, and that the Christians were appealing to a Bible they did not know. He writes in the preface to Isaias, addressed to Eustochium: "I have toiled in a strange language to this end—that the Jews should no longer insult His (Christ's) Church for the falsity of the Scriptures." Throughout Jerome's allusions to the translation we can plainly discern the gracious figures of the matron and maiden, Paula and Eustochium, in the background, cheering him in his heavy task, following its progress with eager enthusiasm, lending whatever aid they can in the details of the undertaking. This element of the eternal feminine in Jerome's gigantic task, so far removed from the ordinary interests and pleasures of the sex, invests the making of the Vulgate with an unexpected grace.

To turn to a factor of quite a different order, the Septuagint is by no means a negligible quantity in the genesis of the Vulgate, for Jerome enjoyed the rare advantage of access to Origen's monumental "Hexapla" edition of that version, comprising in parallel columns the Alexandrian master's critical recension of the Septuagint and Aquila's, Symmachus' and Thedotion's independent Greek translations of the Old Testament—a combination affording invaluable aid for reference in the work.

Since the Hebrew copy which St. Jerome used was older by almost six centuries than our most ancient existing manuscripts in that language—the very oldest is dated 916 A. D.—it would

[17] The Septuagint is the Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible, made by Alexandrian Jews in the third century before Christ.

appear at first sight that Jerome's text had an immense advantage in point of purity over the Hebrew which has come down to us and which is known as the Masoretic text. But an acquaintance with the history of the Jewish Bible rebuts this presumption. Strange to say, the hundreds of Hebrew manuscripts in existence show an almost stereotyped uniformity. They represent a single type most carefully reproduced by the copyists. We find among them only accidental and trifling differences, far removed from the marked variations between our Hebrew text and that which the Septuagint translators had before them. And when we seek to know when the Hebrew Bible took on this uniformity we can with reasonable certainty determine the time as about the middle of the second century of our era. The Vulgate and the quotations of the Talmudists prove that far back in the centuries the Jews had a single recension of the Old Testament which was fixed as well as the most scrupulous and religiously exact hand copying could fix it, and practically identical with the current text. So by taking the beginning of the Talmudic writings as the *terminus ad quem* we arrive at the conclusion that about 150 A. D. the Jewish doctors adopted a standard text and destroyed all other types so effectually that we possess but a single papyrus fragment as a manuscript witness of their existence. But the text underlying the Septuagint testifies indisputably that there were varying types of the Hebrew before the above period.

St. Jerome's Hebrew copy therefore was almost identical with that which is found in the printed Hebrew Bibles of to-day, and which formed the basis of the Protestant Authorized or King James Old Testament. The few variations deducible can be explained by the fact that Jerome had to depend on oral tradition to supply the vowels, and herein he had an advantage over the moderns, for this tradition was about four centuries older than that which the Masoretic scribes fixed by vowel points.[18]

But what assurance have we that our sole surviving Hebrew text is approximately true to that which came from the hands of the inspired writers? The Israelitic copyists were not always so scrupulous in keeping unity of text unimpaired and in transcribing the sacred rolls. That marked variations or rather types existed among ancient copies of the Hebrew Scriptures is a fact of which we are warned by the contents of the Septuagint, the Greek Bible translated from the Hebrew in the third century before Christ. In places its underlying text is obviously superior to our Hebrew, notably in the books of Samuel and Kings. But the differences at

[18] Here and there, it seems, Jerome substituted Septuagint readings for his current Hebrew.

most affect only details of no great consequence, and we can rest confident that the Masoretic text, which is virtually that of St. Jerome, preserves the sacred originals in a high degree of integrity.

St. Jerome began his great enterprise of a Latin version direct from the Hebrew, about the year 390, by translating the books of Samuel and Kings. The entire work extended over fifteen years, being interrupted by other literary activity, correspondence, illness, controversies and other afflictions. Circumstances hastened the doing of several books. Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and the Canticle of Canticles were despatched in three days in order not to disappoint expectant friends.[19] An Aramaic Tobias detained him only the single day he had the help of a friendly rabbi skilled in that language.[20] Literary accuracy necessarily suffered from this haste, but Jerome set no great store by punctilious exactness of expression. He cared little for nicety of wording except when needed to bring out the sense. This was his controlling aim according to a principle he laid down in a letter to a friend, "non verba considerandа in scripturis, sed sensus." With the substantial sense of all the books of the Jewish Bible long years of reading had made him familiar, and his book-a-day rendering of the three Solomonic writings are marvelous for the circumstances.

Tobias and Judith more palpably show looseness. But there are ulterior reasons for this. Alone among the early fathers of the Church St. Jerome had a slight esteem for the seven books not found in the Hebrew Scriptures and not received by Protestants, but venerated by the Church as equally sacred and inspired with the rest. These are Tobias, Judith, Baruch, Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus, First and Second Machabees. To them are to be added the parts of Esther and Daniel whose originals exist only in Greek, that is of the former, chapter x., 4 to the end of the book, and for Daniel, the canticle of the three youths in the fiery furnace inserted between iii., 23 and 24 of the Hebrew, the stories of Bel and the Dragon and Susannah and the Elders. These books and additions, called "deutero-canonical" by Catholics, and the "Apocrypha" by non-Catholics, constitute the great difference between Catholic and Protestant Bibles.

No definite canon of Scripture had yet been formally imposed on the Universal Church, though the immemorial reading of the deutero-canonical books in the churches was a practical canonization, persisting amid the questionings which arose in the fourth century. So it was that Jerome, overinfluenced by Palestinian tradition, doubted the inspired character of these portions of the

[19] Preface to the Books of Solomon.
[20] Preface to Tobias.

Old Testament. That he translated Tobias and Judith, from Aramaic originals, was due to his deference to the desire of certain Bishops. As for the rest of the seven, which were either composed in Greek (Wisdom, II. Machabees) or whose Hebrew originals were lost (Baruch, Ecclesiasticus, I. Machabees), we saw that Jerome had deemed them unworthy of revision. Hence our versions of these in the Vulgate come directly from the Old Latin untouched by the Doctor of Bethlehem. He translated the Greek additions to Daniel from Theodotion's version and borrowed the non-Hebrew parts of Esther from the Old Latin without revising.[21]

At Eustochium's request St. Jerome translated Josue, Judges and Ruth, while lamenting the loss of Paula, who died in 404. Tobias and Judith seem to have been the last, and the task was completed about 405. The great work was at length done, and well done. The only one of the age who was capable of it, the providential sage who embraced the learning of his world, who united a thorough knowledge of the classic tongues, a mastery of Hebrew, a familiarity with Oriental life—such a one had given to the Church a new Bible.

Of course, there are defects in it. The wonder is that there are not more. But after all faults are acknowledged and deductions made, the Vulgate remains one of the greatest monuments of Christian zeal giving energy to learning and power. The grandeur of the achievement grows as we contemplate this masterpiece which wrested the sacred ideas from a forbidding and unexplored language and for the first time clothed them in a Western one. Therefore the Old Testament of the Vulgate is more than a mere translation. It is almost a creation. And the anguish, the tears, the long and heavy toil of the penitent recluse of Bethlehem are in it. Instinctively we honor the heroic soul and masterful mind who performed the work. And it is a pleasure to find the latest Protestant student of the Vulgate, Mr. H. J. White, gladly reëchoing the grateful words of the Protestant translators of the Authorized Version, words which Catholics may well make their own: "This moved St. Hierome, a most learned Father, and the best linguist without controversy of his age, to undertake the translating of the Old Testament out of the very fountains themselves; which he performed with that evidence of great learning, judgment, industry and faithfulness that hath forever bound the Church unto him in a debt of special remembrance and thankfulness."[22]

The new version met with scant favor at first. Even sane and moderate men like St. Augustine shook their heads and questioned

---

[21] Commentary on Daniel xii., 13. Translation of Esther, Migne, Vol. XXVIII., xv., 5.

[22] The translators to the reader.

its expediency. The body of the faithful, always extremely sensitive to changes in traditional forms, looked askant at Jerome's work as a mischievous innovation. An African Bishop excited a riot in his church when he read from the new translation, in Jonas iv., 6, the word *ivy* (hedera) instead of the familiar *gourd* (cucurbita).[23] Slowly, very slowly, the version won recognition by its intrinsic superiority, for no ecclesiastical decree or statute gave it an official standing. But Jerome did not see its triumph except perhaps by prevision. By the time of the Lateran Council, 647, the Vulgate had prevailed in the Roman and Italian churches, but it was not until the eighth century that it had supplanted the antique version everywhere and Venerable Bede could call the latter old.[24] However, the Old Latin was very tenacious of life, and even as late as the twelfth century enjoyed a certain practical value.

The appended synopsis shows at a glance the composition and the intermediate and ultimate sources of our Latin Bible (LXX= Septuagint):

OLD TESTAMENT.

All books except the following translated directly from the Hebrew: Psalms (revised twice), Old Latin, LXX.....Hebrew
Baruch, Ecclesiasticus, I. Machabees (not revised), Old Latin, LXX., Hebrew
Tobias, Judith, Aramaic .....Hebrew
Wisdom, II. Machabees (not revised), Old Latin, LXX.....Greek
Esther x., 4; xvi., 24 (not revised), Old Latin, LXX.....Greek
Daniel iii., 24-90 (not revised), Old Latin, Theodotion's Greek.....Hebrew
Daniel xii., xiv. (not revised), Old Latin, Theodotion's Greek.....Greek

NEW TESTAMENT.

All books are revisions of the Old Latin.....Greek
N. B.—St. Matthew's Gospel was composed originally in Aramaic or Hebrew.

THE TRANSMISSION OF THE VULGATE.

The Vulgate underwent the fate of all literature which could not be preserved and multiplied except by hand copying. The deterioration of its text could be prevented only by such extraordinary precautions and rigid rules as enabled the Talmudic and Masoretic scribes to hand down a uniform Hebrew type. But Christian copyists did not practice this letter-worship, and though they naturally gave greater care to the transcription of the Bible than that of mere human compositions, it was copied much oftener and hence the chances of error were so much increased as to offset the caution of copyists. Even to-day, with all our facilities for procuring pure texts, long lists of errata are features of early editions of large books. If Bibles are exceptions, it is because their texts have been reprinted and revised so often that all but absolute correctness is attained.

[23] Augustine to Jerome, Migne, Vol. XXII., col. 929, 930.

[24] Commentary on Genesis xi., 31.

Before the invention of printing it was morally impossible to have a universally accessible text, fixed in form and serving as a standard. With the best available copy before him and the best of will, the eye of the tired scribe would go amiss; the more familiar phrases of the older version or another text would unawares glide into the manuscript through his mind; a note or gloss placed in the margin would through the inadvertence or officiousness of later copyists creep into the body of the page. Accordingly the most serious errors in manuscript Latin Bibles are interpolations. But at first ignorance and officiousness led to adulterations in other forms. Cassiodorus, an abbot of the sixth century, is the first we know to have applied himself to remedy the already degenerate state of St. Jerome's version. The regulations he imposed on his monks to guide them in copying and amending reveal the fact that the alterations of his time had come chiefly from those who were offended at grammatical solecisms and strange expressions they found in the copy before them and judged that St. Jerome could not have written such bad Latin.[25]

The history of the reproduction of the Bible of the Middle Ages—that is the Vulgate—has two quite different aspects. One is that of devotional art, in which we see the patient and loving labor of the expert copyist, usually a monk, producing with sure and skilful touch those wonderfully regular and beautiful pages of cursive script or black-letter, interspersed with exquisite illuminations, all compelling our admiration as we gaze at one of these mediæval manuscripts which are the most prized treasures of large libraries and wealthy collectors. The other side of the story is that of new errors with each new copy, a progressive corruption of the text, arrested at times by intermittent efforts at purification.

The limits of this essay will permit scarcely more than an enumeration of the principal of these. In the long periods of the history of the Vulgate extending from the early Middle Ages down to the Council of Trent in the sixteenth century, there are three well-marked epochs: 1. Alcuin's revision. 2. The Correctoria and Paris Bible of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. 3. The printed editions of Stephanus.

1. Alcuin, Charlemagne's chancellor, abbot of St. Martins at Tours and the great scholar of his time, was charged by his imperial master with the task of Bible reform.[26] His efforts, seconded by Charlemagne's powerful influence, effected some good, but failed to bring about practical uniformity even in his own day. The

[25] "De Integritate Divinarum Litterarum," Migne, Pat. Lat. Vol.LXX., 1,105 ff.

[26] See the capitularies or decrees providing for the correction of the whole Bible; Berger, "Histoire de la Vulgate," pp. 185-186.

Bibles of this era, though magnificent in adornment, betray many variations from each other.[27] 2. The most intelligent and scholarly endeavor to restore the Vulgate's text in its purity was that of the correctors of the thirteenth century, witnessed now in the emended and annotated manuscript Bibles called *correctoria*. They strove to amend the Paris Bible, the edition in general use, and unfortunately an interpolated and depraved text.[28] Yet we must guard against an exaggerated view of the condition of the Bible of the Middle Ages. For substantial fidelity to Jerome's text abided under the shifting form of details, and that Bible can be justly described as corrupt only relatively to its original textual perfection. This is proved by an inspection of the manuscripts or an examination of the Biblical quotations of the scholastic theologians. 3. The printed editions of the fifteenth century were uncritical, perpetuating many of the faults of the Paris Bible. Robert Estienne, latinized into Stephanus, a scholar-printer of Paris, brought out an edition in 1528 which aimed at a critical restoration. This was improved upon in subsequent issues. The Stephanus Bible is the ultimate printed basis of the official edition of the Vulgate.[29]

The critical taste of the Renaissance found much fault with the inelegant Latinity of the ancient version, and a number of would-be classical editions, some revisions, others translations anew of the Hebrew and Greek, appeared to add to the already sufficient confusion. The Council of Trent took cognizance of the situation, but first it solemnly reaffirmed the traditional canon of the Scriptures, declaring that the books of the Old and New Testaments, "as they are accustomed to be read in the Catholic Church and are found in the ancient Latin Vulgate edition," be received as sacred and canonical with all their parts. Of course, this canonization did not extend to the language and wording of St. Jerome's version, but only to the ideas they convey. No one pretends that Jerome was an inspired translator. The sacredness of a version is necessarily mediate and conditioned on the completeness and exactness with which it reproduces the thoughts of the inspired originals.

The preference shown by the fathers of Trent for the Vulgate could have little more than a theoretic value until that would be redeemed from the corruption and doubts entangling it. The

---

[27] Cf. Berger, "Histoire de la Vulgate," 225-226.

[28] Roger Bacon calls it "horribiliter corruptus." Opus Majus, ed. Jebb, p. 49. Cf. H. Denifle O. P. in "Archiv für Literatur des Mittelalters," Freiburg, 1888, IV., 281.

[29] In view of this fact, the character of Estienne's material is important, but we are able to identify only four out of the fourteen manuscripts he used. Of these the best go back to the ninth century, and have much critical value. See the catalogue of manuscript in Berger, p. 408.

Council took two wise measures to put an end to the existing chaos of translations and texts. It chose the Vulgate as against all modern Latin versions to be the "authentic," that is, authoritative one, and so to be used exclusively in all public readings, disputations, sermons and expositions.[30] And it resolved to ask the Holy See to take in hand the reformation of the Vulgate and the establishment of a typical or standard edition.

That Trent applied the term "authentic" in its ancient legal sense of "authoritative," and not in that of absolute fidelity to the originals, is a fact evinced by the proceedings preparatory to the decree, as well as the text of the decree itself. The act was a practical, not a dogmatic one.

The Council's action regarding the Vulgate was hailed with pleasure by the Catholic world in general as putting an end to the bewilderment of various current versions. But the Humanists were disgruntled at this exclusive approval of what, in their eyes, was a barbarous relic of an unenlightened age. Curiously, these mutterings found echoes at Rome, where the Renaissance was at its height and Humanism strongly intrenched. Cardinals of the Curia and not a few Roman theologians shook their heads at the decree and feared that the Council had set its weighty stamp upon a version undeserving of it. Pope Paul III. himself hesitated for a while to give the act his sanction, doubting the wisdom of formally authorizing a version of Holy Writ all of whose faults could not be ascribed to copyists and printers. The episode is fully illustrated by the serious correspondence upon the subject between officials of the Roman court and one of the Cardinal Legates presiding at Trent,[31] and it is curious to see the legate pleading for the approval of the decrees as they came from the synod. But they at length obtained the Papal confirmation and have full binding force to-day.

The Holy See, as requested by the Council, undertook the revision of the ecclesiastical Bible with a view to an official and standard text. The true path to uniformity was at length entered upon. A pontifical commission was appointed, sitting at Rome. Like most Roman committees it proceeded on its task slowly and deliberately. The preliminary work had begun promptly on the sanction of the Biblical decrees in 1546 by Paul III. In 1561—a new commission having been appointed meanwhile—the results had reached such a stage that Pope Pius IV. was about to arrange for publication, but

---

[30] De Editione et Usu Sacrorum Librorum, Sess. IV.

[31] Printed in Father Vercellone's essay, Sulla autenticità della. . . . Bibbia volgata, etc., pp. 12 ff. Also in the same author's Dizzertazione Accademiche, Rome, 1864, pp. 79-87. The latter work also gives the text of the original documents for the subsequent history of the revision.

desisted when the commission urged that it was not yet satisfied that its labors were ripe for the press.

Rome's majestic slowness is not without its drawbacks, and the Catholic world would have unduly suffered for the want of a standard edition, actualizing the boon of Trent's decrees, if the default had not been partially supplied by individual and corporate enterprise. It is fair to say, however, that this was stimulated not only by the Tridentine statute regarding the printing of the authorized version, but also by the motion of the Apostolic See.[32] The famous Antwerp printer Plantin published between 1546 and 1573 a series of critical editions of the Latin Bible, based on the best text of Stephanus and carefully prepared by John Henten and other learned members of the Louvain faculty of theology.

It was the idea of Cardinal Peretto, later Pope Sixtus V., that an emended edition of the Septuagint would be a valuable help in the correction of the Vulgate Old Testament. In consequence the commission's labors were diverted to this enterprise, and during nine years work on the Vulgate waited the completion of the scholarly Sixtine Septuagint. As for the Greek New Testament, the revisers had at their command the celebrated Codex Vaticanus or Vatican manuscript, dating from the fourth century and considered by most modern critics the purest and most precious of the ancient copies.

When the Septuagint was finally out of the way that energetic and autocratic Pontiff, Sixtus V., pushed the work with commendable zeal. All the resources of Papal authority were employed to bring to Rome the oldest and best Latin codices, or at least copies of their variations. The monks of Sant Amiato were reluctantly compelled to part with the treasure of their library, the noted Codex Amiatinus of the eighth century and the acknowledged prince of Vulgate manuscripts. An examination of the official text shows that in the ultimate form of the revision the Amiatine copy and kindred manuscripts filled a respectable but by no means predominant part. In most of the *important* variant readings the typical Vulgate is not in company with them.[33]

The commission which wrested with the accumulation of material left by its predecessor and collected by Sixtus V. was a truly representative body, counting among its members the learned Italian

---

[32] See the dedication to Gregory XIII. of Plantin's Bible, partially reprinted in Kaulen, "Geschichte der Vulgata," p. 433, note.

[33] In this regard I have collated four chapters, representing the four Gospels. Out of seventy-seven readings where the Amiatine excels, the standard Vulgate follows it in forty-seven. Twelve of the seventy-seven are important, affecting the sense. The official text agrees with the Amiatine in only two of these.

Jesuits Agelli and Bellarmin, the French critical scholar Morin, the Spanish Valverde and the English Cardinal Allen, who had been the moving spirit of the Rheims-Douay English version. This was undoubtedly the ablest of the series of revising boards which labored at the task, and on the whole its influence was the greatest.

The principles by which it was guided, and which with two exceptions were followed to the finish, are set forth in a document prefixed by Sixtus to the edition of 1590. The correctors were to restore as nearly as morally possible the text as it came from the hands of St. Jerome. They were to treat with respect readings consecrated by long ecclesiastical usage and refrain from making changes of a startling nature. The first authority was to be allowed to manuscripts, and this according to their age. Second were to come quotations of the Fathers. Recourse was to be had to the Hebrew and Greek only when the foregoing criteria left the reading obscure or ambiguous. The results were noted in the margin of the best edition of Henten's Bible, which served therefore as the immediate basis. Henten's preface informs us that he consulted thirty-one manuscripts and two editions, but it is impossible to identify any of the former, and the critical merits of this heir to Stephanus cannot be historically determined. Finally the revisers were instructed that the text as printed would be definitive; no alternative readings were placed in the margin.

The commission at length turned over the result of its toil to Sixtus V. But that Pope, who as Cardinal had belonged to the revising body, revised the revision, retouching with a free hand and on his individual judgment. So numerous were the changes he made that when the long expected official edition appeared in July, 1590, the learned commission could not recognize the child of its arduous travail. Their vexation was naturally great. The Pontiff died soon after, happy to have brought his cherished project to completion. But before his successor was chosen the president of the committee whose results had been so rudely treated caused the sale of the Sixtine edition to be stopped.

The delicate problem of an honorable burial of the discredited Sixtine Bible was solved under Gregory XIV. in the following manner: It was determined that the official Vulgate should be reprinted under the name of Sixtus V., after being purged of his ill-advised changes. A new commission was named, embracing some of the ablest members of the former body. The Sixtine rules were kept with two wise modifications. In choosing between variant readings of manuscripts the Hebrew and Greek texts were given precedence over the Fathers. Again a traditional reading stood only when supported by some testimony of critical worth;

but one entirely wanting critical authority was not to be spared, no matter how long current. Some doubtful readings were left to the decision of the Pope. But Gregory XIV. died on the eve of the intended publication of the revision, and the official Bible suffered another setback.

Clement VIII. was raised to the throne in 1592. The Vulgate was fated to undergo another, and this time a superfluous revision. The new Pope entrusted the charge to two Cardinals and the learned Jesuit Toletus, the latter of whom did practically all the work. It was completed in seven months, and the new Bible appeared in 1592 with the name of Sixtus in the title page. It was Sixtine in the sense that, broadly speaking, the methods followed were those prescribed by Sixtus V., and the bulk of the conclusions of the Sixtine commission retained. But this edition, henceforth and at present the typical one, is better known as the Clementine.

Between the beginning and close of the undertaking of which the Clementine Vulgate is the final fruit forty-six years had elapsed and twelve Popes reigned. Revision had come upon revision, and human learning and scholarship provided with large means had spent itself in the work. Yet it is not perfect, and the official preface disclaims that the edition is a faultless restoration of St. Jerome's translation. But no one may dispute the words of the same preface concerning this Clementine Bible of 1592, "that it is not to be doubted that it is purer and more correct than any other text which has appeared down to this time." Modern criticism may pick flaws in the standard Vulgate, but nevertheless in the text officially fixed after a scrutiny of unexampled thoroughness, the Catholic Church has given to itself and the world an approximately pure recension of the most historic and time-honored of the Christian versions.

THE RHEIMS AND DOUAY VERSION (OR OUR ENGLISH CATHOLIC BIBLE).

The merciless anti-Catholic laws of Elizabeth's reign not only proscribed the priesthood, but made it impossible for young Catholic Englishmen to prepare themselves even remotely for the ranks of the clergy by a college education, as the universities and schools were closed to all of the old faith who were not ready to sacrifice their religious principles. In consequence the Catholic student was driven to the Continent.

To meet these conditions and supply devoted missionaries to keep alive Catholic faith in the mother country, at the peril of their lives, various seminaries and schools were established on the Continent.

None is so long and closely linked with the struggles of Catholicism in England as the missionary college, or as it would now be styled, seminary of Douay, the seat of a university, then in the Netherlands, and now in Northern France. It was established in 1568 through the efforts of a remarkable man, Dr. William Allen, later a Cardinal. Through some causes which are obscure, but probably political in their nature, the faculty and students removed to Rheims, France, in 1578. It was there that the New Testament was translated and published—the first printed English edition issued under Catholic auspices.[34]

We are fortunate in being able to trace the inception of the Rheims-Douay Bible in a Latin letter written by President Allen under the date of 1578 and preserved in the English College at Rome.[35] After describing the methods taken to familiarize the students with Holy Scripture, the writer refers to the difficulty of Catholic preachers in handling a Bible translated in a tongue unknown to the auditors. "When they are preaching to the unlearned and are obliged on the spur of the moment to translate into the vulgar tongue some passage which they have quoted, they often do it inaccurately and with unpleasant hesitation, either because there is no vernacular version of the words or it does not then and there occur to them. Our adversaries, on the other hand, have at their fingers' ends, from some heretical version, all those passages of Scripture which seem to make for them, and by a certain deceptive adaptation and alteration of the words produce the effect of appearing to say nothing but what comes from the Bible. This evil might be remedied if we, too, had some Catholic version of the Bible, for all the English versions are most corrupt. I do not know what you have in Belgium. But certainly we on our part will undertake, if His Holiness shall think proper, to produce a faithful, pure and genuine version of the Bible, in accordance with the edition approved by the Church, for we already have men most fitted for this work."

Within a month the much needed version was begun, and the following entry in the college diary for 1578 tells us the plan followed in translating the New Testament, and doubtless later the Old: "On October 16th or thereabouts Martin (Licentiate in theology) began a translation of the Bible into English, with the object of healthfully counteracting the corruptions whereby the heresies have so long lamentably deluded almost the whole of our country-

[34] Regarding Catholic manuscript Bibles in English, the reader is referred to Abbot Gasquet's "Old English Bible and Other Essays;" also to an article by the present writer in the *Catholic World* of March, 1904.

[35] Letters and memorials of Cardinal Allen in "Records of English Catholics," 1882, Vol. II., pp. 52 ff.

men. In order that the work—most useful as it is hoped—may be published the more speedily, he completes daily the translation of two chapters, which, to secure greater correctness, are read through by Allen, our President, and Bristow, our Master, who in their wisdom faithfully correct whatever seems to need emendation."[36]

The great burden of the heroic enterprise of translating the whole Bible was thus borne by a single man, Gregory Martin. How was he fitted for such a task? He had been a scholar of St. John's College, Oxford, and later tutor in the family of the Duke of Norfolk. He had a name among his fellows for the highest skill in Hebrew and the classics. When the Duke visited Oxford a deputation from the university addressed him and paid a high compliment to their former associate, Martin: "You have, illustrious Duke, our Hebraist, our poet, our ornament and glory."[37] Wood, the chronicler of noted Oxonians, says of him: "He was a most excellent linguist, exactly read and versed in the Sacred Scriptures, and went beyond all of his time in human literature, whether in poetry or prose."[38] In addition to this proficiency in Latin, Greek and Hebrew, Martin joined the valuable advantage of familiarity with the current English versions of the Bible as appears from a treatise from his pen entitled "A Discoverie of the Manifold Corruptions of the Heretikes of Our Daies, Especially the English Sectaries, &, Rheims, 1582."

The translation followed the Vulgate with almost servile exactness. Says the preface to the New Testament of 1582: "We are very precise and religious following our copie, the old vulgar approved Latin, not only in sense, which we hope we alwaies doe, but sometimes in the very words and phrases." The words of the title, "Diligently compared with the Greeke," are not an idle boast. The Greek Testament lay before Martin, and it left its impress on the Rheims, first in the numerous Greek readings on the margin of the original editions, and more prominently as a guide in the choice of the article, wanting in Latin. The other editions in "divers languages" are not named, but it is extremely probable that the diction was influenced by the traditional phraseology which is the common stock of the English Protestant Bibles, beginning with Tyndale's. Another borrowed element may be discerned in the form of the Rheims-Douay Version. Martin and his colleagues had an English translation of the Vulgate New Testament ready to hand in Coverdale's, and as Dr. J. C. Carleton has remarked, the Rhemish trans-

[36] Douay College Diaries, Vol. I. of "Records of English Catholics," p. 162.
[37] Athenae Oxonienses, col. 487, Vol. I., edition of 1813.
[38] Ibid.

lation has a considerable number of readings in common with Coverdale's work.[39]

But what is at once the characteristic literary trait and the disfigurement of the Rheims-Douay is its many Latinisms, such as *inhabiters of the land*, Gen. l., 11; *in latitude* for "in a spacious place," Osee iv., 16; *impudicities* for "immodesties," Mark vii., 21; *celestials* for "heavenly places," Eph. ii., 6; *concorporat and comparticipant*, Eph. iii., 6; *exinanited himself* for "emptied himself," Philip ii., 7. This strong admixture of curious Latin-English in the Anglo-Saxon stream of its language was due to an exaggerated reverence for the Vulgate, leading the translators to keep its verbal forms as far as possible, and sometimes even to coin strange words from the Latin.

The translators claim entire sincerity for their work, while not without reason accusing the contemporary Protestant versions with corrupting the sense. "We boldly avouch," they wrote, "the sincerities of this translation, and that nothing is here either untruly or obscurely done of purpose in favor of the Catholike Roman religion." This assertion has not been disproved. Dr. Scrivener, an eminent Protestant critic, testifies: "In justice it must be observed that no case of wilful perversion has ever been brought home to the Rhemish translators."[40] It is true the phraseology of the Rheims has a sacerdotal and sacramental turn. "Presbyter" (Greek, *presbuteros)* is rendered by "priest;" "justitia" *(dikaiosune)*, by "justice;" "poenitentiam agere" *(metanoiein)*, by "do penance;" "sacramentum" *(musterion)*, by "sacrament." All of these renditions—which have been kept in the current revision of the Rheims—may be criticized from a linguistic point of view, and it is quite possible that they were partially the result of theological preoccupations, but in every case except "priest" (it had been for centuries the traditional sense of "presbyter" in the Church) they are amply explained by the translators' policy of adhering to the Vulgate's forms.

The New Testament was printed at Rheims in 1582. Martin lived to see this event, but the tremendous strain he had borne for several years proved fatal to his health, and in September of the same year he died and was buried at Rheims. The Rheims and Douay Bible bears the consecration of this supreme sacrifice of a noble life spent in the service of the Church.

The Old Testament had been done into English immediately after the New, but the faculty's poverty, their "poor estate in ban-

[39] "The Part of Rheims in the Making of the English Bible," p. 30.

[40] Supplement to the Authorized Version, 1845; quoted in Cotton's "Rhemes and Doway," p. 156.

ishment," as they quaintly phrase it, forced them to defer the publication of this part. It appeared at length at Douay (whither the college had returned) in 1609 and 1610. As the official or Clementine edition of the Vulgate was now available, the Old Testament was conformed to this, and the marginal Greek readings omitted.[41] Both Testaments are accompanied by explanatory notes, in accordance with the spirit of the Church, which has been hostile to placing the Bible in the hands of the laity without precautions against the waywardness of private interpretation.

These notes are voluminous in the New Testament of 1582, and of the polemical character of that age of fierce theological controversy. It was chiefly on their account that its publication evoked a mass of acrid criticism and several bulky "confutations" from English Protestants. But the translators of the King James, while not sparing a fling at the Rheims in their preface, had quietly made the despised Popish version do yeoman service in the preparation of their Bible. There are no fewer than 2,383 places where the Authorized agrees with the Rheims against all then existing English versions of note, and a Protestant scholar has recently demonstrated that the King James' "debt to Roman Catholic Rheims is hardly inferior to her debt to Protestant Geneva."[42]

CHALLONER'S BIBLE.

The Rheims-Douay version filled an urgent need and performed good service. But with the lapse of time its spelling and some of its words became obsolete, and its Latinisms grew more uncouth to readers who contrasted it with the pure and idiomatic English of the Protestant Bible. There was an increasing demand for a more suitable and intelligible form of the Sacred Word for English-speaking Catholics. In 1718 Dr. Nary, an Irish priest, published a new translation of the New Testament, and in 1730 appeared another by Dr. Witham, of Douay College. But neither of these enterprises succeeded in taking the place of the old Rheims. It was a century since this had been reprinted. In 1738 a handsome folio edition of the Rheims was issued with modernized spelling and a few verbal improvements. But this after all was a makeshift and failed to satisfy the want of an idiomatic Bible. Another entered the field of Biblical revision who was destined to succeed and whose work endures. This was Richard Challoner.

One of the most singular ironies of literary history is the oblivion that has befallen the capital part of Dr. Challoner in the production

[41] Preface to the Douay Old Testament, 1609.

[42] "The Part of Rheims in the Making of the English Bible," by Dr. Jas. G. Carleton, D. D., 1902, p. 31.

of our English Catholic Bible. The scholar and zealous prelate who gave us that Bible is not awarded even the scant recognition of placing his name on the title pages of reprints of his version—except perhaps in connection with certain brief notes. To read the title pages and introductory notices of our current editions one would suppose that the evolution of our vernacular Bible had been arrested where it began, in the sixteenth century, and that our publishers are furnishing us very accurate reproductions of the antique and curious translation of Gregory Martin.

Richard Challoner was born of Protestant parents in 1691 in Sussex, England. Early left fatherless, he was placed by his poor mother under the protection of a Catholic family belonging to the gentry of the neighborhood. His talent attracted notice and he was sent to Douay College, where he showed marked ability in the classics, especially in Greek. Here, at the age of twenty-one, he became a Catholic, and after completing his studies was ordained a priest and sent to his native land, where the field of his labors was London and Southern England. His learning, talents and virtues were recognized by Vicar Apostolic Petre, and he was made coadjutor of the London vicariate in 1741, succeeding to the administration in 1758, at the age of sixty-seven. He died, aged ninety, in 1781, after having passed through the sore trial of Gordon's No-Popery riots, the shock and anxiety of which occasioned his death.[43] His life was full of zeal and literary activity, for he left some forty controversial, historical and religious works, but none of these can be compared in value and importance with his revision of the Rheims and Douay Bible. It was as Coadjutor Bishop that he accomplished this. There is good reason to suppose that he had been concerned in the Rheims New Testament of 1738, and then realized the inadequacy of anything short of a thorough revision of the old version.[44] Challoner's New Testament appeared in 1749 at London, and the next year he published the whole Bible.

He has left us no account of the principles and methods he followed. We are therefore thrown back on the evidence of the version itself. From this it appears that the ruling idea was to render the ancient Rheims-Douay more intelligible and acceptable to modern readers. The literalisms were replaced by idiomatic forms, the construction was modernized and obsolescent terms made way for familiar ones. In short, Challoner's Bible is infinitely better adapted to modern readers than the old version. The great majority of its constant variations from the Rheims-Douay are in the direction of improvement.

[43] "Life of Dr. Richard Challoner," by Rev. T. Barnard, 1793, passim.
[44] "Barnard's Life," p. 128. Compare Cotton's "Rhemes and Doway," 47.

It is true Dr. Challoner's revision sacrificed here and there pithy and felicitous Anglo-Saxon words and phrases which in the ancient Bible stood side by side with cumbrous Latinisms. But the reviser, while erring sometimes in taste, had sufficient literary tact to retain many of these, and what we lost through him in this manner we regain by the Anglo-Saxonisms he borrowed from the Authorized. So we have scattered through our current Bible a goodly number of expressions which lend a quaint, archaic flavor to the vernacular form of the sacred text. Most of these are original with the older version. Instances are *heart* instead of *bowels*, Gen. xliii., 30; *goodman of the house*, Matt. xii., 37; *comely*, Eccli. xxv., 6; *carefulness* for *solicitude*, II. Cor. vii., 11; *Why make you this ado?* Mk. v., 39; *word sower*, Acts xvii., 18. We owe a few to Challoner himself, as *falleth out*, Ex. xvii., 16; *He will bring those evil men to an evil end*, Matt. xxi., 41. On the other hand, there are palpable literary blemishes in Challoner's Version, most of which are legacies from the Rheims-Douay. There is often a halting, unrhythmical quality in the style. This is frequently due to a survival of Latin words, as *inhabit, conduct*, when Anglo-Saxon equivalents would have been better employed. *Was* or *were come* is a weak substitute for *came* or *had come;* the flaccid *would* is too often found where the original demands *willed* or *desired, e. g.*, Col. i., 27. The force of the Latin *autem* and the Greek de is often ignored or weakened, where the King James renders by *yea* or *now* very happily. A minor fault is the capricious alternation of *hath* and *has*.

Turning from the literary merits of Challoner's Bible to consider it simply as a translation, we naturally ask: Is it a good faithful version? The answer must be that it has the essential virtue of fidelity in a high degree. The sense of the Vulgate is often imperfectly reproduced, for no translation can be an exact equation of its original. But comparatively few actual mistranslations may be charged against our English Bible, and these are almost invariably of minor consequence. Five chapters taken at random from different parts of the version should be fairly representative. Careful examination of Exodus xviii. reveals no erroneous translation. In Psalms xxxiii. there is none; in Ecclesiasticus xxv. there is one.[45] The New Testament is slightly inferior. Chapter xxviii. of St. Luke, in the common text, contains three minor mistakes;[46] II. Corinthians vii., a short chapter, two.[47] With a slight qualification we have in Challoner's revision an accurate translation of the official

[45] "Not to be imagined by the mind" fails to convey the meaning of "insuspicabilia cordis," which is "surprising things."

[46] *To this place* for usque huc, v. 5; *cried again* for succlamabant, 21 (corrected in the edition of 1752); *drew on* for illucescebat, 54.

[47] *For you* for in vobis; *boast boasting* for gloriari, gloriatio, v. 14.

Vulgate, and the many instances where it does not conform to the Hebrew and Greek originals are due to the very fact that it is a faithful reproduction of the Latin version both for the better and the worse. In other words, in a vast majority of cases the fault is with the Vulgate and not with Challoner.

It is for the same reason, namely, that Challoner is habitually so true to his originals, that his voluntary departures from them are so surprising and notable. For it is a fact that with the standard text he took intentional liberties, few and scattered, indeed, in comparison with the great mass, but nevertheless many in the aggregate. There are few chapters wherein some little conscious deviation from the Vulgate may not be found. The changes are modest, inasmuch as they extend only to words and phrases, but bold inasmuch as they are in contravention of typical text and ecclesiastical version. Sometimes they are in the form of an extreme freedom of interpretation in order to approach nearer to the sense of the Hebrew or Greek. But time and again, especially in the Old Testament, Challoner simply parts company with the Vulgate to give a rendering truer to the originals than the scrupulous Rheims and Douay had dared. In doing so the revision generally, though not invariably, adopts the Protestant reading. To illustrate, there are three deviations of this kind in Exodus xxiii;[48] two in Proverbs x.;[49] two in Osee iv.;[50] four in Luke xxiii.;[51] one in II. Corinthians vii.[52]

Yet Dr. Challoner was not thoroughly consistent, for we occasionally meet cases in which the older version is more faithful to the original than his revision.

It is abundantly clear that the revision was done with constant reference to the original texts, that is the Hebrew and Greek, and that these exercised a notable influence upon the work. Dr. Challoner also kept in view the typical or Clementine Vulgate, which had appeared after the Rheims New Testament had been published.

Still more tangible is the influence of the Protestant Authorized, more familiarly known as the King James Version. An overwhelming preponderance of Challoner's literary changes are in the direction of the Protestant Bible. Doubtless many of these are merely natural coincidences and would have been chosen regardless of the Authorized Version, but the not infrequent identities where other words might easily have been employed leave no question

[48] In verses 5, 6, 27.
[49] See 4, 9, 14, 23.
[50] In 4, 19.
[51] Verses 2, 10, 22, 26.
[52] Verse 7.

that the King James was constantly before the translator and exercised a very considerable influence in the diction of the new version.

I have called Challoner a translator and his edition a version. And indeed the changes he introduced are so marked and considerable that the identity of the old Bible disappears in them. What Cardinal Newman said of Challoner's labors upon the New Testament may with equal correctness be applied to the Old: "They issue in little short of a new translation."[53] The result of these labors mediates between a thorough revision and an independent translation. It merits the name "Challoner's Version" as properly as the Protestant Revised is conceived as a version distinct from the Authorized. If we have any right to call our current English text the "Douay Bible," as is the common usage among us, it is on the slender ground that its author aimed to keep the readings of the Rheims-Douay so far as was consistent with a thoroughly improved version of the Vulgate.

Nothing will so well illustrate the evolution which the Rheims-Douay Bible underwent as the appended parallels. The influence of the King James upon Challoner (and in rare cases on the Rheims of 1738) is indicated by italicizing the words which coincide with the Protestant against the older version, while Challoner's departures from the Vulgate to the sense of the Greek are shown by placing the words or phrases between asterisks:

PSALM CXVII., 1-17.

Douay.	Challoner, Denvir's Edition.
1. Confesse ye to our Lord because he is good; because his mercie is for ever.	*Give* praise to *the* Lord *for* he is good: for his mercy *endureth* for ever.
2. Let Israel now say that he is good: that his mercie is for ever.	Let Israel now say, that he is good: that his mercy *endureth* for ever.
3. Let the house of Aaron now say: that his mercie is for ever.	Let the house of Aaron now say, that his mercy *endureth* for ever.
4. Let them now say which feare our Lord; that his mercie is for ever.	Let them that fear *the* Lord now say, that his mercy *endureth* for ever.
5. From tribulation I invocated our Lord: and our Lord heard me in largeness.	*In* my trouble I *called upon the* Lord; and *the* Lord heard me and enlarged me.
6. Our Lord is my helper: I will not feare what man can doe to me.	*The* Lord is my helper: I will not fear what man can do unto me.
7. Our Lord is my helper: and I will look over mine enemies.	*The* Lord is my helper: and I will look over mine enemies.
8. It is good to hope in our Lord, rather than to hope in man.	It is good to * confide * in *the* Lord rather to * have *confidence* * in man.
9. It is good to hope in our Lord, rather than to hope in princes.	It is good to * *trust* * in *the* Lord, rather than to * trust * in princes.
10. All nations have compassed me: and in the name of our Lord am I revenged on them.	All nations have compassed me *about*, and in the name of the Lord I have been revenged on them.
11. Compassing they have compassed me, and in the name of our Lord I was revenged on them.	Surrounding me they have compassed me *about:* and in the name of *the* Lord I have been revenged on them.
12. They compassed me as bees,	They surrounded me *like* bees, and

[53] "Tracts, Theological and Ecclesiastical," 1895, p. 416.

and were inflamed as fyre in thornes: and in the name of our Lord I was revenged on them.

13. Being thrust I was overturned to fal: and our Lord received me.

14. Our Lord is my strength, and my prayse: and he is made my salvation.

15. The voice of exultation, and of salvation in the tabernacles of the just.

16. The right hand of our Lord hath wrought strength: the right hand of our Lord hath exalted me, the right hand of our Lord hath wrought strength.

17. I shal not die, but shal live: and I wil tel the workes of our Lord.

they burned like fire among thorns; and in the name of the Lord I was revenged on them.

Being pushed I was overturned *that I might* fall: * *but* * *the* Lord supported me.

The Lord is my strength and my praise; and he is *become* my salvation.

The voice of *rejoicing* and of salvation * *is* * in the tabernacles of the just.

The right hand of *the* Lord hath wrought strength: the right hand of *the* Lord hath exalted me: the right hand of *the* Lord hath wrought strength.

I shall not die, but live and shall *declare* the works of *the* Lord.

The easy superiority of the Revision in rhythm, in purity of English, in the suppression of the unbiblical "our Lord" is seen at a glance.

EPHESIANS III., 1-14.

Rheims of 1582.	Rheims of 1738.	Challoner, Denvir's Ed.
1. For this cause, I Paul the prisoner of IESUS Christ, for you Gentiles:	For this cause, I Paul the prisoner of JESUS Christ, for you Gentils:	For this cause, I Paul the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles;
2. If yet you have heard the dispensation of the grace of God, which is given me toward you,	If yet you have heard the dispensation of the grace of God, which is given towards you.	If yet you have heard *of* the dispensation of the grace of God which is given me towards you.
3. Because according to revelation the Sacrament was made knowne to mee, as I have written before in brief.	Because, according to revelation, the sacrament was made known to me, as I have written before in brief:	*How that*, according to revelation, the *mystery* has been made known to me, as I have written above in *a few words;*
4. According as you reading may understand my wisdome in the mystery of Christ.	According as you reading may understand my wisdom in the mystery of Christ,	As you reading, may understand my *knowledge* in the mystery of Christ,
5. Which unto other generations was not knowne to the sonnes of men, as now it is revealed to his holy Apostles and Prophets in the Spirit:	Which unto other Generations was not known to the sons of men, as now it is reveal'd to his holy Apostles and Prophets in the Spirit.	Which *in* other generations was not known to the sons of men, as *it is now* revealed to his holy apostles and prophets in the Spirit:
6. The Gentiles to be coheirs and concorporat and comparticipant of his promise in Christ IESUS by the Gospell:	*That* the Gentils are co-heirs and *of the same body* and *partakers* of his promise in Christ JESUS by the Gospel:	*That* the Gentiles *should be fellow-heirs*, and *of the same body*, and co-partners of his promise in Christ Jesus, by the gospel:
7. Whereof I am made a Minister according to the gift of the grace of God, which is given mee according to the operation of his power:	Whereof I am made a Minister according to the gift of the grace of God, which is given to me according to the operation of his power:	Of which I am made a minister, according to the gift of the grace of God, which is given to me according to the operation of his power:
8. To mee, the least of all the Saints, is given this grace among the Gentiles to evangelize the unsearchable riches of Christ.	To me, the least of all the Saints, is given this grace, among the Gentils to *preach* the unsearchable riches of Christ.	To me, the least of all the saints, is given this grace, to *preach among the Gentiles* the unsearchable riches of Christ,
9. And to illuminate	And to illuminate all	And to enlighten all

all men what is the dispensation of the Sacrament hidden from the worlds in God, who created all things:

10. That the manifold wisdome of God may be notified to Princes and Postestats in the celestials by the Church,

11. According to the prefinition of worlds, which he made in Christ IESUS our Lord.

12. In whom we have affiance and accesse in confidence, by the faith of him.

13. For which cause I desire that you faint not in my tribulations for you, which is your glory.

14. For this cause I bowe my knees to the Father of our Lord IESUS Christ.

men what is the dispensation of the sacrament hidden from worlds in God, who created all things:

That the manifold wisdom of God may be notified to the Princes and *Powers* in the celestials by the Church,

According to the prefinition of worlds, which he made in Christ JESUS our Lord.

In whom we have affiance and access in confidence by the faith of him.

For which cause I desire that you faint not in my tribulations for you, which is your glory.

For this cause I bow my knees to the Father of our Lord JESUS Christ,

men that they may *see* what is the dispensation of the *mystery which hath been* hidden from eternity in God, who created all things:

That the manifold wisdom of God may be made *known* to the *principalities* and *powers* in *heavenly places* through the church,

According to the *eternal * purpose,** which he made, in Christ Jesus our Lord:

In whom we have *boldness* and access *with* confidence by the faith of him.

Wherefore I pray you not to faint at my tribulations for you, which is your glory.

For this cause I bow my knees to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,

The stylistic changes which the editors of the New Testament of 1738 made in verses 6, 8, 10 mark that issue as a real, though very modest transition between the original Rheims and Challoner's. The reading of verse 16 reveals that the 1738 edition was not conformed to the standard Vulgate.

Dr. Challoner published an edition of the New Testament in 1752, which differs not a little in phrasing and construction from that of 1749, and generally for the better. To illustrate: In Matt. xvi. "Who said," verse 6, becomes "And he said;" verse 8, "for that ye have," "because you have;" verse 20, "he commanded," "he charged;" "Go behind me, Satan," is improved to "Get thee behind me, Satan;" 25, "he that will save," "whosoever will save;" 26, "what exchange will a man give for his soul?" becomes "what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" All but the first of these readings of 1752 are conformed to the Authorized. These differences between Challoner's first and third edition of the New Testament total more than two thousand. We have almost absolute fixity in the Old Testament "Douay," for Challoner's version of 1750 has not been retouched. But our New Testaments have no such uniformity. The Troy New Testament, so called from Archbishop Troy, of Dublin, who gave it approbation, was a recension of Challoner's of 1752, with many original variations. Troy's strongly influenced the Haydock Bible, famous for its copious notes and first published in England in 1810-11. A text based on Haydock's was first printed in America in Dunigan's magnificent folio edition of 1852-56. I say *based* because the unknown American editor introduced not a few differing readings. Later large editions

of Bibles copy Haydock's faithfully, without always seeming to be aware of the fact. Indeed, what may be called the preceding generation of English Catholic Bibles, the large family editions, no longer in favor, were both in our own country and England strongly colored by the Troy New Testament, which, though based on Challoner's of 1752, has, as we have seen, a character of its own. These are the only modern Bibles which have been affected by the text of 1752; the tincture is very slight and our American editions have acquired it in the roundabout way of *via* Haydock, *via* Troy.

But of late years, since the ponderous family Bibles have been superseded by handy octavos and small quartos, there has been a return to Challoner pure and simple, without any Troy admixture. Most contemporary American editions are reprints of the text edited by Dr. Denvir, Bishop of Down and Connor, early in the last century. Denvir closely follows Challoner's New Testament of 1749, borrowing only a few words from the third edition, among them the questionable "that" for "who" and "which." Perhaps Bishop Denvir looked coldly upon Challoner's edition of 1752 because of its more pronounced leaning toward the Protestant Version. Anyhow, it has come about that the type of the New Testament prevailing in the United States and Ireland reproduces the less rhythmical and felicitous of Challoner's editions. In England Haydock's Challoner with its foreign element seems still to be ascendant, so that neither there is the edition of 1752 received. Further, for America and Ireland at least it is true that the multiplicity of texts of the New Testament, which recent Protestant essayists have exaggerated,[54] is rapidly disappearing, for our leading Bible publishers, by reprinting Challoner's text of 1749, are bringing about a desirable uniformity.

Dr. Challoner's Old Testament is undoubtedly the received text of all English-speaking Catholics. As seen above, the United States and Ireland practically have one accepted form of the New Testament also. The writer cannot speak with authority for England, Canada and the British possessions, but everywhere *some* recension of Challoner is in use. Challoner's Bible has never received the formal approbation of the Holy See.[55] But it has been authorized by ecclesiastical statutes or the formal sanction of Bishops. It is in the former manner that the version, taken generally without specification of a typical edition, enjoys the status of official approval in the United States.[56] Theoretically, the old

[54] "Catholic and Protestant Bibles Compared," 1905, containing the prize essays of the Gould competition.

[55] See "Concilia Baltimorensia," 1851, p. 66.

[56] "Conc. Balt.," pp. 26, 77; "Concilium Balt." Plen. II., Acta et Decreta, No. 16.

Rheims and Douay has the same privilege. In Ireland, Denvir's Bible received the recommendation of the hierarchy in the form of a declaration prefixed to a Dublin edition of 1857. So far as observed no formal approbation has been given to the "Douay" in England, Scotland and the British colonies beyond that of individual Bishops. But in all countries the authorization is merely positive and does not exclude the public and private use of other Catholic translations of the Vulgate.

We have had three English versions by Catholics since Challoner's: Dr. Lingard's Four Gospels, translated mainly from the Greek text, which was published in 1836 and has seen at least one more edition, viz., 1851; Archbishop Kenrick's[57] Bible, appearing by parts between 1849 and 1860, a translation from the Latin, and finally the Gospels translated by Father A. F. Spencer, O. P., from the Greek, with reference to the Vulgate and Syriac, and published in 1898. All these are works of real scholarship, but Dr. Kenrick's translation, being the only one faithful to the ecclesiastical version, is alone in any situation to compete with Challoner's Bible as a current text for public use. But it has not met with popular favor, and indeed the form of its only complete edition—a number of separate octavo volumes—was unsuited to a wide circulation. The Four Gospels alone reached a second edition.

Challoner's attempt succeeded owing to a combination of intrinsic merit, the author's prestige and the peculiar circumstances of the time. But the day is past when any translation or revision of the Scriptures by individual scholarship can hope to win public confidence and widespread acceptance. The conservative sense is strong in this field. Only the prestige and authority of a Catholic university or body of collective scholarship can take up the enterprise of a new version with the promise of both intrinsic success and popular esteem for the work. But even so, the result would be disappointing to the learned unless the translators would be permitted, in a measure exceeding Dr. Challoner's, to go behind the Latin text in order to correct certain crying errors. If such latitude would not be enjoyed, the improvement would be utterly disproportionate to the labor. If we must keep strictly to the Vulgate, that would be an unwarranted attempt that would seek to replace our time-honored and excellently received English version.

George Joseph Reid.

St. Paul's Seminary, St. Paul, Minn.

[57] Of Baltimore.

PIUS PP. X.

MOTU PROPRIO.

De Protonotariis Apostolicis, Praelatis Urbanis, et Aliis

Qui Nonnullis Privilegiis Praelatorum Propriis Fruuntur.

INTER multiplices curas, quibus ob officium Nostrum apostolicum premimur, illa etiam imponitur, ut venerabilium Fratrum Nostrorum, qui episcopali charactere praefulgent, pontificales praerogativas, uti par est, tueamur. Ipsi enim Apostolorum sunt Successores; de iis loquitur Cyprianus (ep. 69, n. 8) dicens, "Episcopum in Ecclesia esse et Ecclesiam in Episcopo;" nec ulla adunatur Ecclesia sine Episcopo suo, imo vero Spiritus ipse Sanctus "posuit Episcopos regere Ecclesiam Dei" (Act. xx., 38). Quapropter, "Presbyteris superiores esse Episcopos," iure definivit Tridentinum Concilium (Sess. xxiii., c. 7). Et licet Nos, non tantum honoris, sed etiam iurisdictionis principatum supra ceteros Episcopos, ex Christi dispositione, tamquam Petri Successores, geramus, nihilominus Fratres Nostri sunt Episcopi, et sacra Ordinatione pares. Nostrum ergo est, illorum excelsae dignitati sedulo prospicere, eamque pro viribus coram christiano populo extollere.

Ex quo praesertim Pontificalium usus per Decessores Nostros Romanos Pontifices aliquibus Praelatis, episcopali charactere non insignitis, concessus est, id saepe accidit, ut, vel malo hominum ingenio, vel prava aut lata nimis interpretatione, ecclesiastica disciplina haud leve detrimentum ceperit, et episcopalis dignitas non parum iniuriae.

Quum vero de huiusmodi abusibus ad hanc Apostolicam Sedem Episcoporum querelae delatae sunt, non abnuerunt Praedecessores Nostri iustis eorum postulationibus satisfacere, sive Apost. Litteris, sive S. Rit. Congr. Decretis pluries ad rem editis. In id maxime intenderunt Benedictus XIV., per epist. S. R. Congr. d. d. 31 Martii MDCCXLIV., "SSmus Dominus Noster," iterimque idem Benedictus, d. 17 Februarii MDCCLII., "In throno iustitiae;" Pius VII., d. 13 Decembris MDCCCXVIII., "Cum innumeri," et rursus idem Pius, d. 4 Iulii MDCCCXXIII., "Decet Romanos Pontifices," et Pius IX., d. 29 Augusti MDCCCLXXII., "Apostolicae Sedis officium." E sacr. Rit. Congregatione memoranda in primis Decreta quae sequuntur: de Praelatis Episcopo inferioribus, datum die 27 mensis Septembris MDCLIX. et ab Alexandro VII. con-

firmatum; dein Decreta diei 22 Aprilis MDCLXXXIV. de Canonicis Panormitanis; diei 29 Ianuarii MDCCLII. de Canonicis Urbinatibus; diei 27 Aprilis MDCCCXVIII. de Protonotariis Titularibus, a Pio PP. VII. approbatum; ac diei 27 Augusti MDCCCXXII. de Canonicis Barensibus.

Hisce tamen vel neglectis, vel ambitioso conatu, facili aufugio, amplificatis, hac nostra aetate saepe videre est Praelatos, immoderato insignium et praerogativarum usu, praesertim circa Pontificalia, viliores reddere dignitatem et honorem eorum, qui sunt revera Pontifices.

Quamobrem, ne antiquiora posthabeantur sapienter a Praedecessoribus Nostris edita documenta, quin imo, ut iis novum robur et efficacia adiiciatur, atque insuper praesentis aevi indoli mos iuste geratur, sublatis omnibus consuetudinibus in contrarium, nec non amplioribus privilegiis, praerogativis, exemptionibus, indultis, concessionibus, a quibusvis personis, etiam speciali vel specialissima mentione dignis, nominatim, collective, quovis titulo et iure, acquisitis, assertis, aut praetensis, etiam Praedecessorum Nostrorum et Apostolicae Sedis Constitutionibus, Decretis, aut Rescriptis, confirmatis, ac de quibus, ad hoc, ut infirmentur, necesse sit peculiariter mentionem fieri, exquisito voto aliquot virorum in canonico iure et liturgica scientia peritorum, reque mature perpensa, motu proprio, certa scientia, ac de Apostolicae potestatis plenitudine, declaramus, constituimus, praecipimus, ut in posterum, Praelati Episcopis inferiores aliique, de quibus infra, qua tales, non alia insignia, privilegia, praerogativas audeant sibi vindicare, nisi quae hoc in Nostro documento, Motu Proprio dato, continentur, eademque ratione ac forma, qua hic subiiciuntur.

A.—De Protonotariis Apostolicis.

1. Quatuor horum habeantur ordines: I. Protonotarii Apostolici de Numero Participantium, septem qui Collegium privative constituunt; II. Protonotarii Apostolici Supranumerarii; III. Protonotarii Apostolici ad instar Participantium; IV. Protonotarii Apostolici Titulares, seu honorarii (extra Urbem).

I.—Protonotarii Apostolici de Numero Participantium.

2. Privilegia, iura, praerogativas et exemptiones quibus, ex Summorum Pontificum indulgentia iamdudum gaudet Collegium Protonotariorum Apostolicorum de numero Participantium, in propriis Statutis nuperrime ab ipsomet Collegio iure reformatis inserta, libenter confirmamus, prout determinata inveniuntur in Apostolicis Documentis inibi citatis, ac praesertim in Constitutione "Quamvis

peculiaris" Pii. Pp. IX., diei 9 mensis Februarii MDCCCLIII., paucis exceptis, quae, uti infra, moderanda statuimus:

3. Protonotarii Apostolici de numero Participantium habitu praelatitio rite utuntur, et alio, quem vocant pianum atque insignibus prout infra numeris 16, 17, 18 describuntur.

4. Habitu quotidiano incedentes, caligas, collare et pileum ut ibidem n. 17 gestare poterunt, ac insuper Annulum gemmatum, quo semper iure utuntur, etiam in privatis Missis aliisque sacris functionibus.

5. Quod vero circa usum Pontificalium insignium, Xystus V. in sua Constitutione "Laudabilis Sedis Apostolicae sollicitudo," diei 6 mensis Februarii MDCLXXXVI., Protonotariis Participantibus concessit: "Mitra et quibuscumque aliis Pontificalibus insignibus, etiam in Cathedralibus Ecclesiis, de illorum tamen Praesulum, si praesentes sint, si vero absentes, absque illorum consensu, etiam illis irrequisitis, extra curiam uti," in obsequium praestantissimae Episcoporum dignitatis, temperandum censuimus, ut pro Pontificalibus, extra Urbem tantum agendis, iuxta S. R. C. declarationem quoad Episcopos extraneos vel Titulares, diei 4 mensis Decembris MCMIII., ab Ordinario loci veniam semper exquirere teneantur, ac insuper consensum Praelati Ecclesiae exemptae, si in ea sit celebrandum.

6. In Pontificalibus peragendis, semper eis inhibetur usus throni, pastoralis baculi et cappae; item septimi candelabri super altari, et plurium Diaconorum assistentia; Faldistorio tantum utentur, apud quod sacras vestes assumere valeant. Pro concessis enim in citata Xysti V. Constitutione, "quibuscumque aliis pontificalibus insignibus," non esse sane intelligenda declaramus ea, quae ipsis Episcopis extra Dioecesim sunt interdicta. Loco Dominus vobiscum numquam dicent Pax vobis; trinam benedictionem impertientur numquam, nec versus illi praemittent Sit nomen Domini et Adiutorium, sed in Missis tantum pontificalibus, Mitra cooperti, cantabunt formulam Benedicat vos, de more populo benedicentes; a qua benedictione abstinebunt, assistente Episcopo loci Ordinario, aut alio Praesule, qui ipso Episcopo sit maior, ad quem pertinet eam impertiri.

7. Ad Ecclesiam accedentes, Pontificalia celebraturi, ab eaque recedentes, habitu praelatitio induti, supra Mantelletum Crucem gestare possunt pectoralem, a qua alias abstinebunt; et nisi privatim per aliam portam ingrediantur, ad fores Ecclesiae non excipientur ut Ordinarius loci, sed a Caeremoniario ac duobus clericis, non tamen Canonicis seu Dignitatibus; seipsos tantum aqua lustrali signabunt, tacto, aspersorio illis porrecto, et per Ecclesiam procedentes populo numquam benedicent.

8. Crux pectoralis, a Protonotariis Participantibus in pontificalibus functionibus adhibenda, aurea erit, cum unica gemma, pendens a funiculo serico rubini coloris commixto cum auro, et simili flocculo retro ornato.

9. Mitra in ipsorum Pontificalibus erit ex tela aurea (numquam tamen pretiosa) quae cum simplici alternari possit, iuxta Caerem. Episcop. (I., xvii., nn. 2 et 3); nec alia Mitra nisi simplici diebus poenitentialibus et in exsequiis eis uti licebit. Pileolo nigri coloris sub Mitra dumtaxat uti poterunt.

10. Romae et extra, si ad Missam lectam cum aliqua solemnitate celebrandam accedant, habitu praelatitio induti, praeparationem et gratiarum actionem persolvere poterunt ante altare, in genuflexorio pulvinaribus tantum instructo, vestes sacras ab altari assumere, aliquem clericum in Sacris assistentem habere, ac duos inferiores ministros. Fas erit praeterea Canonem et Palmatoriam, Urceum et Pelvim cum Manutergio in lance adhibere. In aliis Missis lectis, a simplici Sacerdote ne differant, nisi in usu Palmatoriae. In Missis autem cum cantu, sed non pontificalibus, uti poterunt etiam Canone et Urceo cum Pelvi et lance ad Manutergium.

11. Testimonium autem exhibere cupientes propensae voluntatis Nostrae in perinsignem hunc coetum, qui inter cetera praelatorum Collegia primus dicitur et est in Romana Curia, Protonotariis Participantibus, qui a locorum Ordinariis sunt exempti, et ipsis Abbatibus praecedunt, facultatem facimus declarandi omnibus qui Missae ipsorum intererunt, ubivis celebrandae, sive in oratoriis privatis, sive in altari portatili, per eiusdem Missae auditionem diei festi praecepto rite planeque satisfieri.

12. Protonotarius Apostolicus de numero Participantium, qui ante decimum annum ab adepto Protonotariatu Collegium deseruerit, aut qui a decimo saltem discesserit, et per quinque alios, iuxta Xysti V. Constitutionem, iisdem privilegiis gavisus fuerit, inter Protonotarios ad instar eo ipso erit adscriptus.

II.—Protonotarii Apostolici Supranumerarii.

13. Ad hunc Protonotariorum ordinem nemo tamquam privatus aggregabitur, sed iis tantum aditus fiet, qui Canonicatu potiuntur in tribus Capitulis Urbis Patriarchalium, id est Lateranensis Ecclesiae, Vaticanae ac Liberianae; itemque iis qui Dignitate aut Canonicatu potiuntur in Capitulis aliarum quarumdam extra Urbem ecclesiarum, quibus privilegia Protonotariorum de numero Apostolica Sedes concesserit, ubique fruenda. Qui enim aut in propria tantum ecclesia vel dioecesi titulo Protonotarii aucti sunt, aut nonnullis tantum Protonotariorum privilegiis fuerunt honestati neque Protonotariis

aliisve Praelatis Urbanis accensebuntur, neque secus habebuntur ac illi dequibus hoc in Nostro documento nn. 80 et 81 erit sermo.

14. Canonici omnes, etiam Honorarii, tum Patriarchalium Urbis, tum aliarum ecclesiarum de quibus supra, tamquam singuli, insignibus et iuribus Protonotariorum ne fruantur, nec gaudeant nomine et honore Praelatorum, nisi prius a Summo Pontifice inter Praelatos Domesticos per Breve adscripti sint, et alia servaverint quae infra num. 34 dicuntur. Protonotarius autem ad instar, qui Canonicis eiusmodi accenseatur, eo ipso privilegia Protonotarii Supranumerarii acquiret.

15. Protonotarii Apostolici Supranumerarii subiecti remanent proprio Ordinario, ad formam Concilii Tridentini (Sess. 24, c. 11), ac eorum beneficia extra Romanam Curiam vacantia Apostolicae Sedi minime reservantur.

16. Habitum praelatitium gestare valent coloris violacei, in sacris functionibus, idest caligas, collare, talarem vestem cum cauda, nunquam tamen explicanda, neque in ipsis Pontificalibus celebrandis: sericam zonam cum duobus flocculis pariter sericis a laeva pendentibus, et Palliolum, seu Mantelletum supra Rocchetum; insuper nigrum biretum flocculo ornatum coloris rubini: pileum item nigrum cum vitta serica, opere reticulato exornata, eiusdem rubini coloris, cuius coloris et serici erunt etiam ocelli, globuli, exiguus torulus collum et anteriores extremitates vestis ac Mantelleti exornans, eorum subsutum, itemque reflexus (paramani) in manicis (etiam Roccheti).

17. Alio autem habitu uti poterunt, Praelatorum proprio, vulgo piano, in Congregationibus, conventibus, solemnibus audientiis, ecclesiasticis et civilibus, idest caligis et collari violacei coloris, veste talari nigra cum ocellis, globulis, torulo ac subsuto, ut supra, rubini coloris, serica zona violacea cum laciniis pariter sericis et violaceis, peramplo pallio talari item serico violaceo, non undulato, absque subsuto aut ornamentis quibusvis alterius coloris, ac pileo nigro cum chordulis et sericis flocculis rubini coloris. Communi habitu incedentes, caligas et collare violacei coloris ac pileum gestare poterunt, ut supra dicitur.

18. Propriis insignibus seu stemmatibus imponere poterunt pileum cum lemniscis ac flocculis duodecim, sex hinc, sex inde pendentibus, eiusdem rubini coloris, sine Cruce vel Mitra.

19. Habitum et insignia in choro Dignitates et Canonici Protonotarii gerent, prout Capitulo ab Apostolica Sede concessa sunt; poterunt nihilominus veste tantum uti violacea praelatitia cum zona sub choralibus insignibus, nisi tamen alia vestis tamquam insigne chorale sit adhibenda. Pro usu Roccheti et Mantelleti in choro attendatur, utrum haec sint speciali indulto permissa; alias enim

Protonotarius, praelatitio habitu assistens, neque locum inter Canonicos tenebit, neque distributiones lucrabitur, quae sodalibus accrescent.

20. Cappam laneam violaceam, pellibus ermellini hiberno tempore, aestivo autem rubini coloris serico ornatam, induent in Cappellis Pontificiis, in quibus locum habebunt post Protonotarios Participantes. Ii vero Canonici Protonotarii qui Praelati non sunt, seu nomine tantum Protonotariorum, non vero omnibus iuribus gaudent, ut nn. 13 et 14 dictum est, in Cappellis locum non habebunt, neque ultra limites pontificiae concessionis habitu praelatitio et piano, de quibus nn. 16 et 17, uti umquam poterunt.

21. Habitu praelatitio induti, clericis quibusvis, Presbyteris, Canonicis, Dignitatibus, etiam collegialiter unitis, atque Praelatis Ordinum Regularium, quibus Pontificalium privilegium non competat, antecedunt, minime vero Vicariis Generalibus vel Capitularibus, Abbatibus, et Canonicis Cathedralium collegialiter sumptis. Ad Crucem et ad Episcopum non genuflectent, sed tantum sese inclinabunt: duplici ductu thurificabuntur: item si sacris vestibus inruti functionibus in choro adsistant.

22. Gaudent indulto Oratorii privati domi rurique, ab Ordinario loci visitandi atque approbandi, in quo, etiam solemnioribus diebus (exceptis Paschatis, Pentecostes, Assumptionis B. M. V., SS. Apostolorum Petri et Pauli, nec non loci Patroni principalis festis) celebrare ipsi Missam poterunt, vel alius Sacerdos, in propriam, consanguineorum, affinium, familiarium et cohabitantium commoditatem, etiam ad praeceptum implendum. Privilegio autem altaris portatilis omnino carere se sciant.

23. Licet iisdem acta conficere de causis Beatificationis et Canonizationis Servorum Dei, quo tamen privilegio uti non poterunt, si eo loci alter sit e Collegio Protonotariorum Participantium.

24. Rite eliguntur in Conservatores Ordinum Regularium aliorumque piorum Institutorum, in Iudices Synodales, in Commissarios et Iudices Apostolicos etiam pro causis beneficialibus et ecclesiasticis. Item apud ipsos professionem Fidei recte emittunt, qui ex officio ad eam adiguntur. Ut autem iuribus et praerogativis, hic et num. 23 expressis, frui possint Canonici Protonotarii in S. Theologia aut in iure Canonico doctorali laurea insigniti sint oportet.

25. Extra Urbem, et impetrata venia Ordinarii loci, cui erit arbitrium eam tribuendi quoties et pro quibus Solemnitatibus voluerit, atque obtento etiam consensu Praelati ecclesiae exemptae, in qua forte celebrandum sit, pontificali ritu Missas et Vesperas aliasque sacras functiones peragere poterunt. Quod functiones attinet collegialiter, seu Capitulo praesente, celebrandas, a propriis Constitu-

tionibus, de Ordinarii consensu, provideatur, iuxta Apostolica Documenta.

26. Ad ecclesiam accedentes, Pontificalia celebraturi, ab eaque recedentes, habitu praelatitio induti, supra Mantelletum Crucem gestare possunt pectoralem (a qua alias abstinebunt): et nisi privatim per aliam portam ingrediantur, ad fores ecclesiae non excipientur ut Ordinarius loci, sed a Caeremoniario et duobus clericis, non tamen a Canonicis seu Dignitatibus: seipsos tantum aqua lustrali signabunt, tacto aspersorio sibi porrecto, et per ecclesiam procedentes populo numquam benedicent.

27. Pontificalia agent ad Faldistorium, sed vestes sacras in sacrario assument et deponent, quae in Missis erunt: (*a*) Caligae et sandalia serica cum orae textu ex auro; (*b*) Tunicella et Dalmatica; (*c*) Crux pectoralis sine gemmis, e chordula serica rubini ex integro coloris pendens, auro non intertexta, simili flocculo retro ornata; (*d*) Chirothecae sericae, sine ullo opere phrygio, sed tantum orae textu auro distinctae; (*e*) Annulus cum unica gemma; (*f*) Mitra ex serico albo, sine ullo opere phrygio, sed tantum cum orae textu ex auro, et cum laciniis similiter aureis, quae cum simplici ex lino alternari poterit, iuxta Caerem. Episcopor. (I., xvii., nn. 2 et 3); haec vero simplex, diebus poenitentialibus et in exsequiis una adhibebitur; (*g*) Canon et Palmatoria, a qua abstinendum coram Ordinario seu maiori; (*h*) Urceus et Pelvis cum Mantili in lance; (*i*) Gremiale.

28. In Vesperis solemnibus (post quas benedictionem non impertientur) aliisque sacris functionibus pontificaliter celebrandis, Mitra, Cruce pectorali, Annulo utentur, ut supra. Pileolus nigri dumtaxat coloris, nonnisi sub Mitra ab eis poterit adhiberi.

29. In pontificalibus functionibus eisdem semper interdicitur usus throni, pastoralis baculi et cappae; in Missis autem pontificalibus, septimo candelabro super altari non utentur, nec plurium Diaconorum assistentia; Presbyterum assistentem pluviali indutum habere poterunt, non tamen coram Episcopo Ordinario aut alio Praesule, qui ipso Episcopo sit maior; intra Missam manus lavabunt ad Ps. Lavabo tantum. Loco Dominus Vobiscum, nunquam dicent Pax vobis; trinam benedictionem impertientur nunquam, nec versus illi praemittent Sit nomen Domini et Adiutorium, sed in Missis tantum pontificalibus, Mitra cooperti, cantabunt formulam Benedicat vos, de more populo benedicentes: a qua benedictione abstinebunt assistente Episcopo loci Ordinario aut alio Praesule, qui ipso Episcopo sit maior, cuius erit eam impertiri. Coram iisdem, in pontificalibus celebrantes, Mitra, simplici solummodo utantur, et dum illi sacra summunt paramenta, aut solium petunt vel ab eo recedunt stent sine Mitra.

30. De speciali commissione Ordinarii, Missam quoque pro de-

functis pontificali ritu celebrare poterunt Protonotarii Supranumerarii, cum Absolutione in fine, Mitra linea utentes; numquam tamen eamdem Absolutionem impertiri illis fas erit, post Missam ab alio celebratam; quod ius uni reservatur Episcopo loci Ordinario.

31. Romae et extra, si ad Missam lectam cum aliqua solemnitate celebrandam accedant, habitu praelatitio induti, praeparationem et gratiarum actionem persolvere poterunt ante altare in genuflexorio pulvinaribus tantum instructo, vestes sacras ab altari assumere (non tamen Crucem pectoralem et Annulum) aliquem clericum in Sacris assistentem habere, ac duos inferiores ministros; Canonem et Palmatoriam, Urceum et Pelvim cum Manutergio in lance adhibere; sed ante v. Communio manus ne lavent. In aliis Missis lectis a simplici Sacerdote ne differant, nisi in usu Palmatoriae: in Missis autem cum cantu, sed non pontificalibus, uti poterunt etiam Canone, Urceo cum Pelvi, ac lance ad Manutergium, nisi ex statutis vel consuetudine in propria ecclesia haec prohibeantur.

32. Canonico Protonotario Apostolico Supranumerario pontificalia peragere cum ornamentis ac ritu superius enunciatis fas non erit, nisi infra terminos propriae dioecesis; extra autem, nonnisi ornatu et ritu, prout Protonotariis ad instar, ut infra dicetur, concessum est.

33. Cum tamen Canonicos trium Patriarchalium Urbis, ob earumdem praestantiam, aequum sit excellere privilegiis, eo vel magis quod in Urbe, ob Summi Pontificis praesentiam, Pontificalium privilegium exercere nequeunt, illis permittitur, ut in ecclesiis totius terrarum orbis, impetrata Ordinariorum venia, ac Praesulum ecclesiarum exemptarum consensu, Pontificalia agant cum ritu atque ornamentis nn. 27, 28, 29 recensitis. Insuper, licet aliquis ex ipsis inter praelatos nondum fuerit adscriptus, Palmatoria semper, etiam in privatis Missis uti poterit.

34. Recensita hactenus privilegia illa sunt quibus dumtaxat Protonotarii Apostolici Supranumerarii fruuntur. Verum, cum eadem collective coetui Canonicorum conferantur, Canonici ipsi, tamquam singuli, iis uti nequibunt, nisi Praelati Urbani fuerint nominati et antea suae ad Canonicatum vel Dignitatem promotionis et auspicatae iam possessionis, atque inter Praelatos aggregationis, ut num. 14 dicitur, testimonium Collegio Protonotariorum Participantium exhibuerint; coram ipsius Collegii Ducano, vel per se vel per legitimum procuratorem, Fidei professionem et fidelitatis iusiurandum de more praestiterint, ac de his postea, exhibito documento, proprium Ordinarium certiorem fecerint. Quibus expletis, eorum nomen in sylloge Protonotariorum Apostolicorum recensebitur.

35. Canonici ecclesiarum extra Urbem, qui ante Nostri huius documenti Motu Proprio editi publicationem, privilegia Protonota-

riorum, una cum Canonicatu, sunt assequuti, ab expeditione Brevis, de quo supra, num. 14, dispensantur; iusiurandum tamen fidelitatis coram Ordinario suo praestabunt infra duos menses.

36. Collegialiter tamquam Canonici pontificalibus functionibus, iuxta Caeremoniale Episcoporum, sacris vestibus induti adsistentes non alia Mitra utantur, quam simplici, nec unquam hoc et ceteris fruantur Prótonotariorum insignibus et privilegiis extra propriam ecclesiam, nisi in diplomate concessionis aliter habeatur. Canonicus tamen qui forte ad ordinem saltem Subdiaconatus non sit promotus, neque in choro cum aliis Mitra unquam utatur. In functionibus autem praedictis inservientem de Mitra non habebunt, prout in Pontificalibus uni Celebranti competit. Qui in Missa solemni Diaconi, Subdiaconi aut Presbyteri assistentis munus agunt, dum Dignitas, vel Canonicus, aut alter Phivilegiarius pontificaliter celebrant, Mitra non utentur; quam tamen adhibere poterunt Episcopo solemniter celebrante, ut distum est de collegialiter adsistentibus, quo in casu, cum ministrant, aut cum Episcopo operantur, maneant detecto capite.

37. Protonotarius Supranumerarius defunctus efferri aut tumulari cum Mitra non poterit, neque haec eius feretro imponi.

38. Ne autem Protonotariorum numerus plus eaquo augeatur, prohibemus, ne in posterum in ecclesiis, de quibus supra, Canonici Honorarii, sive infra, sive extra Dioecesim degant, binas partes excedant eorum, qui Capitulum iure constituunt.

39. Qui secus facere, aliisve, praeter memorata, privilegiis et iuribus uti praesumpserint, si ab Ordinario semel et bis admoniti non paruerint, eo ipso, Protonotariatus titulo, honore, iuribus et privilegiis, tamquam singuli, privatos se noverint.

40. Sciant praeterea, se, licet forte plures una simul, non tamquam unius ecclesiae Canonici, sed tamquam Protonotarii conveniant, non idcirco Collegium praelatitium constitueri; verum quando una cum Protonotariis de numero Participantium concurrunt, v. gr. in Pontificia Capella, tunc quasi unum corpus cum ipsis effecti censentur, sine ullo tamen amplissimi Collegii praeiudicio, ac servatis eiusdem Cappellae et Familiae Pontificiae consuetudinibus.

41. Si quis (exceptis Canonicis trium Patriarchalium Urbis) quavis ex causa Dignitatem aut Canonicatum dimittat, cui titulus, honor et praerogativae Protonotarii Apostolici Supranumerarii adnexa sint, ab eiusmodi titulo, honore et praerogativis statim decidet. Qui vero Pontificium Breve inter Praelatos aggregationis obtinuerit, horum tantum privilegiis deinceps perfruetur.

III.—Protonotarii Apostolici ad instar.

42. Inter Protonotarios Apostolicos ad instar Participantium illi

viri ecclesiastici adnumerantur, quibus Apostolica Sedes hunc honorem conferre voluerit, ac praeterea Dignitates et Canonici alicuius Capituli praestantioris, quibus collegialiter titulus et privilegia Protonotariorum, cum addito ad instar, ubique utenda, fuerint ab eadem Apostolica Sede collata. Canonici enim qui aut in propria tantum ecclesia vel dioecesi titulo Protonotarii aucti sunt, aut nonnulis tantum Protonotariorum privilegiis fuerunt honestati, neque Protonotariis aliisve Praelatis Urbanis accensebuntur, neque secus habebuntur ac illi de quibus hoc in Nostro documento nn. 80 et 81 erit sermo.

43. Qui Protonotarii Apostolici ad instar tamquam singuli iuribus honorantur, eo ipso sunt Praelati Domus Pontificiae; qui vero ideo sunt Protonotarii quia alicuius ecclesiae Canonici, Praelatis Domesticis non adnumerantur, nisi per Breve Pontificium ut num. 14 dictum est. Omnes Protonotarii ad instar subiecti remanent, ad iuris tramitem, Ordinario loci.

44. Beneficia illorum, qui Protonotarii ad instar titulo et honore gaudent tamquam Canonici alicuius Capituli, si vacent extra Romanam Curiam, Apostolicae Sedi minime reservantur. Beneficia vero eorum, qui tali titulo et honore fruuntur, tamquam privata persona, non poterunt nisi ab Apostolica Sede conferri.

45. Quod pertinet ad habitum praelatitium, pianum et communem, stemmata et choralia insignia, habitum et locum in Pontificia Capella, omnia observabunt, uti supra dictum est de Protonotariis Supranumerariis, nn. 16, 17, 18, 19, 20.

46. Iisdem iuribus gaudebunt, praecedentiae, privati oratorii, conficiendi acta Beatificationis et Canonizationis, passivae electionis in Conservatores, ceterisque; item recipiendae Fidei professionis reverentiae ad Crucem, thurificationis, quibus omnibus fruuntur Protonotarii Supranumerarii, ut supra nn. 21, 22, 23, 24, ac iisdem sub conditionibus.

47. De venia Ordinarii et Praesulis consensu ecclesiae exemptae, extra Urbem, Missas, non tamen de requie, pontificali ritu et ornatu celebrare poterunt, prout supra notatur, ubi de Protonotariis Supranumerariis, nn. 25, 26, 27, 28, 29; verum his legibus: Nec Faldistorio nec Gremiali unquam utantur, sed una cum Ministris in scamno, cooperto panno coloris diei, sedeant; caligis et sandaliis utantur sericis tantum, cum orea textu item serico flavi coloris ornato, et similiter sericis chirothecis sine alio ornamento; Mitra simplici ex serico damasceno, nullo ornamento, ne in oris quidem distincta, cum rubris laciniis ad vittas. Extra Cathedrales Ecclesias tantum, assistentem Presbyterum habere poterunt pluviali indutum, dummodo non assistat Episcopus Ordinarius aut alius Praesul ipso Episcopo maior. Crucem pectoralem auream sine gemmis gerent,

appensam funiculo serico violacei ex integro coloris, auro non intertexto. Omnia, quae in Missa cantanda vel legenda sunt, nunquam ad scamnum, sed ad altare cantabunt et legent. Manus infra Missam lavent tantum ad Ps. Lavabo.

48. Poterunt insuper, pariter extra Urbem, de venia Ordinarii et cum Praesulis ecclesiae exemptae consensu, Mitra, Cruce pectorali et Annulo ornati, ad scamnum, more Presbyterorum, celebrare Vesperas illius festi, cuius Missam ipsi pontificaliter acturi sint, vel peregerint (absque benedictione in fine). Iisdem ornamentis eodemque ritu uti licebit, de speciali tamen commissione Ordinarii, in Vesperis festi, cuius Missa in pontificalibus ab alio quolibet Praelato celebretur, itemque in benedictione cum Sanctissimo Sacramento solemniter (non tamen trine) impertienda, in Processionibus, et in una ex quinque absolutionibus in solemnioribus exsequiis, de quibus in Pontificali Romano.

49. Romae Missam lectam, aliqua cum solemnitate celebrantes, si praelatitio habitu sint induti, ea retineant, quae de Protonotariis Supranumerariis n. 31 constituta sunt; extra Urbem, de speciali tamen commissione Ordinarii, eodem modo se gerent; aliis in Missis et functionibus, tamquam Praelati Domestici, ut n. 78, Palmatoriam tantum, si velint, adhibeant.

50. Qui Canonicorum coetui adscriptus, cui hactenus recnsita Protonotariorum ad instar privilegia concessa sint, tamquam privata persona iisdem uti velit, prius Breve Pontificium, ut dicitur nn. 14 et 43, de sua inter Praelatos Domesticos aggregatione, servatis servandis, obtineat, simulque suae ad Canonicatum vel Dignitatem promotionis, initaeque possessionis ac inter Praelatos aggregationis testimonium Collegio Protonotariorum Participantium exhibeat. Tum coram ipsius Collegii Decano, vel per se vel per legitimum procuratorem, Fidei professionem ac fidelitatis iusiurandum, de more, praestet; de his denique exhibito documento proprium Ordinarium certiorem faciat. Qui vero tamquam privata persona huiusmodi titulum rite fuerit consecutus, non ante privilegiis eidem titulo adnexis uti poterit, quam legitimum suae nominationis testimonium memorato Collegio exhibuerit, Fidei professionem et fidelitatis iusiurandum, uti supra, ediderit, de hisque omnibus authenticum documentum suo Ordinario attulerit. Haec ubi praestiterint, eorum nomen in sylloge Protonotariorum recensebitur.

51. Qui ante has Litteras, Motu Proprio editas, iuribus gaudebant Protonotarii ad instar, tamquam alicuius ecclesiae Canonici, a postulatione Brevis, de quo in superiori numero, dispensantur, quemadmodum et a iureiurando, ut ibidem dicitur, praestando, quod tamen proprio Ordinario infra duos menses dabunt.

52. Habitum et insignia in choro Dignitates et Canonici Pro-

tonotarii gerent, prout Capitulo ab Apostolica Sede concessa sunt; poterunt nihilominus veste tantum uti violacea praelatitia cum zona sub choralibus insignibus, nisi tamen alia vestis, tamquam insigne chorale sit adhibenda. Pro usu Roccheti et Mantelleti in choro attendatur, utrum haec sint speciali indulto permissa; alias enim Protonotarius, habitu praelatitio assistens, neque locum inter Canonicos tenebit, neque distributiones acquiret, quae sodalibus accrescent.

53. Collegialiter tamquam Canonici pontificalibus functionibus, iuxta Caeremoniale Episcoporum, sacris vestibus induti assistentes, non alia Mitra utentur quam simplici, nec unquam hoc aliisve supra memoratis insignibus et privilegiis extra propriam ecclesiam, nisi in concessionis diplomate aliter habeatur. Canonicus tamen, qui forte ad ordinem saltem Subdiaconatus non sit promotus, ne in choro quidem cum aliis Mitra unquam utatur. In functionibus autem praedictis inservientem de Mitra non habebunt, prout in Pontificalibus uni Celebranti competit. Qui in Missa solemni Diaconi, Subdiaconi aut Presbyteri assistentis munus agunt, dum Dignitas, vel Canonicus, aut alter Privilegiarius pontificaliter celebrant, Mitra non utentur; quam tamen adhibere poterunt, Episcopo solemniter celebrante, ut dictum est de collegialiter adsistentibus, quo in casu, cum ministrant, aut cum Episcopo operantur, maneant detecto capite.

54. Protonotarius ad instar defunctus efferri aut tumulari cum Mitra non poterit, nec eius feretro ipsa imponi.

55. Ne autem Protonotariorum numerus plus aequo augeatur, prohibemus, ne in posterum in ecclesiis, de quibus supra, Canonici Honorarii, sive infra, sive extra Dioecesim degant, binas partes excedant eorum, qui Capitulum iure constituunt.

56. Qui secus facere ,aliisve, praeter memorata, privilegiis et iuribus uti praesumpserint, si ab Ordinario semel et bis admoniti non paruerint, eo ipso, Protonotariatus titulo, honore, iuribus et privilegiis, tamquam singuli, privatos se noverint.

57. Sciant praeterea; se, licet forte plures una simul, non tamquam unius ecclesiae Canonici, sed tamquam Protonotarii, conveniant, non idcirco Collegium Praelatitium constituere; verum, quando una cum Protonotariis de numero Participantium concurrent, v. gr. in Pontificiis Cappellis, tunc quasi unum corpus cum ipsis censentur, sine ullo tamen amplissimi Collegii praeiudicio, ac servatis eiusdem Cappellae et Familiae Pontificiae consuetudinibus.

58. Si quis, quavis ex causa, Dignitatem aut Canonicatum dimittat, cui titulus, honor et praerogativae Protonotariorum ad instar adnexa sint, statim ab iisdem titulo, honore et praerogativis decidet. Qui vero Pontificium Breve inter Praelatos aggregationis obtinuerit, horum tantum privilegiis deinceps perfruetur.

IV.—Protonotarii Apostolici Titulares seu Honorarii.

59. Cum Apostolica Sedes, non sibi uni ius reservaverit Protonotarios Titulares seu honorarios nominandi, sed Nuntiis Apostolicis, Collegio Protonotariorum Participantium et forte aliis iamdiu illud delegavarit, antequam de eorum privilegiis ac praerogativis aliquid decernamus, leges seu conditiones renovare placet, quibus rite honesteque ad eiusmodi dignitatem quisque Candidatus valeat evehi, iuxta Pii PP. VII. Praedecessoris Nostri Constitutionem "Cum innumeri," Idibus Decembr. MDCCCXVIII. datam.

60. Quoties igitur de honorario Protonotariatu assequendo postulatio praebeatur, proferantur, ab Ordinario recognita, testimonia, quibus constet indubie: (1) de honesta familiae conditione; (2) de aetate saltem annorum quinque et viginti; (3) de statu clericali ac caelibi; (4) de Laurea doctoris in utroque, aut canonico tantum iure, vel in S. Theologia, vel in S. Scriptura; (5) de morum honestate et gravitate, ac de bona apud omnes aestimatione; (6) de non communibus in Ecclesiae bonum provehendum laudibus comparatis; (7) de idoneitate ad Protonotariatum cum decore sustinendum, habita etiam annui census ratione, iuxta regionis cuiusque aestimationem.

61. Quod si huiusmodi Protonotariatus honor alicui Canonicorum coetui collective ab Apostolica Sede conferatur (quod ius, collective Protonotarios nominandi, nemini censeri posse delegatum declaramus), eo ipso, quo quis Dignitatem aut Canonicatum est legitime consequutus, Protonotarius nuncupabitur.

62. Pariter, qui Vicarii Generalis aut etiam Capitularis munere fungitur, hoc munere dumtaxat perdurante, erit Protonotarius Titularis; hinc, si Dignitate aut Canonicatu in Cathedrali non gaudeat, quando choro interesse velit, habitu Protonotarii praelatio, qui infra describitur, iure utetur.

63. Protonotarii Apostolici Titulares sunt Praelati extra Urbem, qui tamen subiecti omnino manent locorum Ordinariis, Praelatorum Domus Pontificiae honoribus non gaudent, neque inter Summi Pontificis Familiares adnumerantur.

64. Extra Urbem, dummodo Summus Pontifex eo loci non adsit, in sacris functionibus rite utuntur habitu praelatitio, nigri ex integro coloris, idest veste talari, etiam, si libeat, cum cauda (nunquam tamen explicanda), zona serica cum duobus flocculis a laeva pendentibus, Roccheto, Mantelleto et bireto, absque ulla horum omnino parte, subsuto aut ornamento alterius coloris.

65. Extra Urbem, praesente Summo Pontifice, descripto habitu indui possunt, si hic tamquam chorale insigne concessus sit, vel si quis uti Vicarius adfuerit.

66. Habitu praelatitio induti, omnibus Clericis, Presbyteris, etiam

Canonicis, singulatim sumptis, praeferantur, non vero Canonicis, etiam Collegiatarum, collegialiter convenientibus, neque Vicariis Generalibus et Capitularibus, aut Superioribus Generalibus Ordinum Regularium, et Abbatibus, ac Praelatis Romanae Curiae; non genuflectunt ad Crucem vel ad Episcopum, sed tantum se inclinant, ac duplici ductu thurificantur.

67. Super habitu quotidiano, occasione solemnis conventus, audientiae et similium, etiam Romae et coram Summo Pontifice, zonam tantum sericam nigram, cum laciniis item nigris, gestare poterunt, cum pileo chordula ac floccis nigris ornato.

68. Propriis insignibus, seu stemmatibus, pileum imponere valeant, sed nigrum tantummodo, cum lemnicis et sex hinc sex inde flocculis pendentibus, item ex integro nigris.

69. Si quis Protonotarius Titularis, Canonicatus aut Dignitatis ratione, choro intersit, circa habitum se gerat iuxta normas Protonotariis ad instar constitutas, num. 52, vestis colore excepto.

70. Sacris operantes, a simplicibus Sacerdotibus minime differant; attamen extra Urbem in Missis et Vesperis solemnibus, pariterque in Missis lectis aliisque functionibus solemnius aliquando celebrandis, Palmatoria tantum ipsis utenda conceditur, excluso Canone aliave pontificali supellectili.

71. Quod pertinet ad acta in causis Beatificationis et Canonizationis, et ad passivam electionem in Conservatores ac cetera, iisdem iuribus gaudent, quibus fruuntur Protonotarii Supranumerarii, uti nn. 23 et 24 supra dictum est.

72. Beneficia eorum qui, tamquam privatae personae, Protonotariatum Titularem assequuti sunt, non vero qui ratione Vivariatus, Canonicatus sive Dignitatis eodem gaudent, ab Apostolica tantum Sede conferantur.

73. Noverint autem, se, licet forte plures una simul, non tamquam unius ecclesiae Canonici, sed tamquam Protonotarii, conveniant, non ideo Collegium constituere.

74. Tandem qui Protonotariatu Apostolico honorario donati sunt, tamquam privatae personae, titulo, honoribus, et privilegiis Protonotariatus uti nequeunt, nisi antea diploma suae nominationis Collegio Protonotariorum Participantium exhibuerint, Fideique professionem, ac fidelitatis iusiurandum coram Ordinario, aut alio viro in ecclesiastica dignitate constituto emiserint. Qui vero ob Canonicatum, Dignitatem, aut Vicariatum, eo potiti fuerint, nisi idem praestiterint, memoratic honoribus et privilegiis, quae superius recensentur, tantummodo intra propriae dioecesis limites uti poterunt.

75. Qui secus facere, aliisque, praeter descripta, privilegiis uti praesumpserint, si ab Ordinario semel et bis admoniti non paruerint,

eo ipso honore et iuribus Protonotarii privatos se sciant: quod si Protonotariatum, tamquam privata persona adepti sint, etiam titulo.

76. Vicarii Generales vel Capitulares, itemque Dignitates et Canonici nomine atque honoribus Protonotariatus titularis gaudentes, si, quavis ex causa, a munere, Dignitate aut Canonicatu cessent, eo ipso, titulo, honoribus et iuribus ipsius Protonotariatus excident.

B.—De Ceteris Praelatis Romanae Curiae.

77. Nihil detractum volumus honoribus, privilegiis, praeeminentiis, praerogativis, quibus alia Praelatorum Romanae Curiae Collegia, Apostolicae Sedis placito, exornantur.

78. Insuper concedimus, ut omnes et singuli Praelati Urbani seu Domestici, etsi nulli Collegio adscripti, ii nempe, qui tales renunciati, Breve Apostolicum obtinuerint, Palmatoria uti possint (non vero Canone aut alia pontificali supellectili) in Missa cum cantu, vel etiam lecta, cum aliqua solemnitate celebranda; item in Vesperis aliisque solemnibus functionibus.

79. Hi autem habitum, sive praelatitium sive quem vocant pianum, gestare poterunt, iuxta Romanae Curiae consuetudinem, prout supra describitur nn. 16, 17; numquam tamen vestis talaris caudam explicare, neque sacras vestes ex altari assumere valeant, nec alio uti colore, quam violaceo, in bireti flocculo et pilei vitta, opere reticulato distincta, sive chordulis et flocculis, etiam in pileo stemmatibus imponendo ut n. 18 dictum est, nisi, pro eorum aliquo, constet de maiori particulari privilegio.

C.—De Dignitatibus, Canonicis et Aliis, Qui Nonnullis Privilegiis Praelatorum Propriis Fruuntur.

80. Ex Romanorum Pontificum indulgentia, insignia quaedam praelatitia aut pontificalia aliis Collegiis, praesertim Canonicorum, eorumve Dignitatibus, quocumque nomine nuncupentur, vel a priscis temporibus tribui consueverunt; cum autem eiusmodi privilegia deminutionem quamdam episcopali dignitati videantur afferre, idcirco ea sunt de iure strictissime interpretanda. Huic principio inhaerentes, expresse volumus, ut in pontificalium usu nemini ad aliquod ex supra memoratis Collegiis pertinenti in posterum ampliora suffragentur privilegia, quam quae, superius descripta, competunt Protonotariis sive Supranumerariis, sive ad instar, et quidem non ultra propriae ecclesiae, aut ad summum Dioeceseos, si hoc fuerit concessum, limites; neque ultra dies iam designatos, aut determinatas functiones; et quae arctiora sunt, ne augeantur.

81. Quoniam vero de re agitur haud parvi momenti, quippe quae ecclesiasticam respicit disciplinam, ne quis audeat arbitraria interpretatione, maiora quam in concedentis voluntate fuerint, sibi privilegia vindicare; quin potius paratum sese ostendat, quatenus illa excesserint, minoribus coarctari; singulis locorum Ordinariis, quorum sub iurisdictione vel quorum in territorio, si de exemptis agatur, aliquis ex praedictis coetibus inveniatur, demandamus, ut, tamquam Apostolicae Sedis Delegati, Apostolicarum Concessionum documenta ipsis faventia, circa memorata privilegia, infra bimestre tempus, ab hisce Nostris Ordinationibus promulgatis, sub poena immediatae amissionis eorum quae occultaverint, ad se transmitti curent, quae intra consequentem mensem ad Nostram SS. Rituum Congregationem mittant. Haec autem, pro suo munere, omnia et singula hisce Nostris dispositionibus aptans, declarabit et decernet, quaenam in posterum illis competant.

Haec omnia rata et firma consistere auctoritate Nostra volumus et iubemus; contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, die 21 Februarii MCMV., Pontificatus Nostri anno secundo.

Pius PP. X.

Scientific Chronicle

PHYSIOLOGICAL ECONOMY IN NUTRITION.

Under the above title Dr. Russell Chittenden, director of the Sheffield Scientific School of Yale University, has published a book which is remarkable not only for the record of patient investigation which it contains, but still more for the conclusions to which these investigations lead. It is a resumé of an elaborate series of dietary studies which had for their object to determine what was the amount of food requisite to keep the body in health and vigor. Many so-called dietary standards had been proposed, as those, for instance, of Atwater and Voit, but they had been computed from observations made upon men who were consuming an amount of food which it was not at all evident they stood in need of. The excess in their rations would be worked off by the digestive and excretory organs of the body, but with a waste of energy; for all this work would not make for the nourishment of the body and, as far as nutrition was concerned, was of little or no use. To prevent this waste was to establish physiological economy, in which all the organs concerned in nourishing the body were not overburdened by food-stuffs of no value, and often of positive harm, but accomplished just the amount of work necessary for the assimilation of food at a rate sufficient to keep up normal health and strength. If this economy could be brought about, it would mean longer life for the organs in question by the removal of the unnatural strain upon them; it would mean the reduction of diseases consequent on such strain and on the almost certain formation of deleterious substances within the body from the fermentation of the surplus food.

The hitherto accepted standard rations called for about one-fourth of a pound each of fat and protein and a pound of carbo-hydrates. Of these the most important is the protein; indeed, the metabolism of protein may be taken as an index of the nutrition of the body. Now in the amount of protein of the standard ration, about 113 grams, there are about 18 grams of nitrogen. This means that under the standard ration a man doing average muscular labor would consume 18 grams of nitrogen. Dr. Chittenden asks is such an amount of nitrogen necessary; and his experiments show conclusively, we think, that it is not, for with men consuming one-half the amount of protein in the standard dietary the body was putting on nitrogen and there was no loss of health and vigor. There was

an evident physiological economy, and the labor of rejecting the surplus protein was saved. But it is time to explain briefly the doctor's method of procedure.

Beginning with himself, the doctor gradually reduced the amount of his food until at the end of two or three months he was living on half the standard ration. There was no loss of bodily or mental vigor. On the contrary, there was an almost entire absence of fatigue, accompanied by the disappearance of a periodic ailment, which did not reappear, while there was present a feeling of exhilaration and pleasure in labor not felt before. Moreover, in taking bodily exercise there was a sense of power and a power of endurance never before experienced or suspected. Dr. Chittenden realized that these symptoms did not necessarily mean that his body was sufficiently nourished. It was remarkable, however, that he was to all appearances thriving on this low proteid diet, his body weight decreasing slightly in the beginning of the experiment and then remaining practically constant. The small loss was attributed to the disappearance of surplus flesh. To determine if the body was putting on nitrogen, for a week every bit of food taken was analyzed and the amount of nitrogen determined. Upon examination it was found that the amount excreted was less than the amount taken in. There was an undoubted nitrogen balance in favor of the body.

Obviously this one experiment, albeit remarkable, would not suffice to draw a general conclusion from. Similar experiments were performed on four gentlemen of the instructing and administrative departments of the university with like results. Then six athletes, students of the university, were experimented upon, and the results went to confirm the doctor's personal experiment. Finally a detail of thirteen enlisted men from the U. S. Hospital Service went through a similar experience with the same striking results. The salient points of all these experiments are the following:

1. The experiments extended over a period of five or six months. Occasionally this number was exceeded.

2. The amount of food was gradually reduced, and there was no selection of particular foods. Everything the appetite craved was supplied; there was no insistence on particular kinds of diet; temperance and not abstention was the rule.

3. The body weight usually fell slightly in the beginning and then remained constant.

4. General health showed marked improvement. During the term of his restricted diet one of the athletes won the intercollegiate all-round championship. Each one of the soldiers doubled his

muscular strength during the term, when vigorous muscular exercise was indulged in daily for several hours. One, in fact, tripled his muscular strength, and all testified to the great benefit they had derived in every way.

5. At the end of the term a marked repugnance was felt in all cases to a return to former habits. Under the restricted diet the food taken had a new relish.

6. At intervals careful determinations of the input and outgo of nitrogen were made, and there was always a plus balance in favor of the body.

Lest it be thought that the nervous and sensory systems might have suffered harm, it should be mentioned that the most scrupulous examination by the latest approved methods failed to detect any. The composition of the blood was examined, and it was found that it suffered no deterioration. In brief, all the advantages were on the side of the restricted diet, and there were no facts deducible from the experiments to militate against it. Letters to Dr. Chittenden from a large number of persons who have adopted the practice he recommends all testify to the great benefit derived from it. It will be interesting to know just how far his views regarding diet will prevail. They cannot be overlooked in subsequent dietary studies. If they are found to be correct, we shall be delivered, in part at least, from the slavery to our cooks, under which it is said we all labor. It is scarcely necessary to speak of the great economy of time and money that must ensue, if we can live at least as vigorously and with as good health as now on half as much food and drink.

THE DEPLETION OF NIAGARA FALLS.

A great deal of discussion has been raised recently over the attempt of a few capitalists to obtain extensive privileges in using the water of Niagara Falls for generating power. Not so many years ago we enthused over the vast projects conceived for this same purpose, for we thought of the good that would result from the cheapening of electrical energy and the consequent cheapening of the necessities of life that could be thereby manufactured. But we had no idea that this would mean the practical destruction of the Falls; no idea that water enough would be diverted into the tunnels of the power companies to make any appreciable difference in the flow over the escarpment. We may be surprised to learn that some observers who have lived near the Falls and have seen them

for years honestly believe that there has been already a visible decrease. We shall most certainly be surprised to know that there is proximate danger of the entire depletion of the American Falls. If this takes place, may not the depletion of the Canadian Falls follow from the same cause?

In the *Popular Science Monthly* for April, 1905, Dr. John M. Clarke, New York State geologist, gives a few facts which show this proximate danger. According to the generally accepted figures, 224,000 cubic feet of water flow over the falls in one second. Only one-fourth of this water flows over the American Falls. Now, it so happens that the sill or edge of the Falls is ten feet higher on the American than on the Canadian side, making the waters on the American side ten feet shallower. Taking both these facts into consideration, it will be easily seen that the abstraction of water from above the Falls will make itself felt on the American side first. The amount of abstraction necessary to bring down the level of the water to the edge of the sill on the American side has been calculated by a competent engineer to be 40,000 cubic feet per second. If this amount reach 80,000 cubic feet, the American Falls will be dry. Is there any prospect that this amount will be reached?

There are two American and three Canadian companies which have charter rights to utilize 48,000 cubic feet of water per second. These five companies are already operating or about to operate. This means that the water level will soon reach the rock bottom at the American edge of the Falls. Besides this, there is another company with an *unrestricted* charter, which may be relied upon, if it begins operations, to utilize not less than 10,000 cubic feet of water; and a proposal has been made by which four companies on the Canadian side will utilize 29,996 cubic feet. The aggregate, 87,996 cubic feet of water per second, if diverted from its course, will leave the American Falls dry.

No lover of the beauties of nature can contemplate this threatened destruction without sadness and indignation. It is the project of men who see no use in the Falls except a commercial one. There is no thought of the hundreds of thousands of tourists who visit the cataract every year. The editor of the *Scientific American* calls this a spirit of brutal utilitarianism, and says there is no warrant for this destruction, since "equal energy can be developed in other ways, such as utilizing less important waterfalls or by burning bituminous coals under steam boilers." Dr. Clarke points out that since "the working companies are established in their rights," we must find a remedy that will respect these rights and yet save the Falls. He says: "Protection for Niagara means control of power production." He continues: "In taxation of the power product, not

. . . . . .

necessarily for revenue, but for protection, seems to me to lie the sole means of control of the problem, the only way of saving our national pride before the bar of the world."

Mr. Alton D. Adams, in the *Engineering Magazine* for June, suggests a remedy of a different nature. He points out that the Niagara river in descending 100 feet from the base of the great cataract to the foot of the escarpment at Lewiston and Queenston, five miles down stream, develops 2,500,000 horse-power, and he goes on to show how by a system of tunnels or by damming the river at Lewiston, horse-power sufficient could be utilized to "provide all the energy that could be utilized within 300 miles of the Falls in at least the next half century."

SOME MORE STIMULANTS TO PLANT GROWTH.

In the April QUARTERLY we described a method of forcing plants by means of anæsthetics. Two new methods have recently attracted attention. The first utilizes electricity, the second the light afforded by burning acetylene. That electricity had some influence on plant growth seems to have been first suggested by the fact that within the zone of action of the aurora borealis, a violent electrical manifestation as is well known, there is a luxuriant vegetation, although the conditions usually thought requisite, such as abundance of sunlight and heat, are absent. In 1885 Professor Lemstrom, of Helsingfors, made a series of experiments in which he submitted seeds in pots to the influence of a static electric machine, connecting one pole with the soil in the pot and the other with a cage of wire netting placed over it. Inside of a week the growth showed greater vigor over that of similar but untreated seed. In eight weeks there was a difference in favor of the treated seeds of forty per cent. Field experiments were then made, and, although some contradictory results were obtained, increases of from 30 to 125 per cent. for various plants were manifest. Suitable climate, plenty of water, rich soil and abundant manuring were found to be essential. Later investigators worked with seeds before germination and got favorable results, one striking fact being that dry seeds were not affected, the effect of the electricity apparently being to stimulate the action of the moisture, which of itself is a factor in promoting germination.

Through motives of economy Lemstrom in 1898 was led to try the effect of atmospheric electricity upon plants. He began by covering a portion of a field with wire netting, which shielded the

plants beneath from the action of the electricity in the atmosphere. The adjacent plants, which were uncovered, showed an increase of fifty or sixty per cent. in growth and fruitfulness over the covered ones. A cheaper method, which is nevertheless almost too expensive to have wide usefulness, was devised by Lagrange and Paulins, and consisted of placing galvanized iron rods among the plants, the rods serving as conductors. This method had great success, and with the others shows great promise of future utility, especially when applied to the cultivation of fruits, flowers and vegetables under glass.

Acetylene gaslight has been shown spectroscopically to bear a close resemblance to sunlight. Might it not then act somewhat as sunlight does in affecting plant growth? Professors Bailey and Craig, of Cornell University, have shown that it does so act. In one series of experiments two sets of plants were taken. Both were exposed to sunlight during the day, and at night one was kept in the dark, while the other was kept under acetylene light. To quote the *Acetylene Journal:* "It is seen that thirty-seven radishes on the light or acetylene side of the curtain aggregated 136 grams, as against thirty-eight radishes on the dark side reaching but 61 grams, less than half. The behavior of peas, under which blooms and good-sized pods were present by the aid of acetylene, at a time when without this not even buds were apparent, is equally marked." It may be added in conclusion that striking results were also obtained with plants never exposed to the action of the sun's rays.

The commercial application of these two methods is a problem awaiting solution.

ALCOHOL FROM SAWDUST.

Alcohol is usually manufactured from the starch contained in potatoes, rice and other grains. The first step in the process is the conversion of the starch into glucose by heating it with sulphuric acid, which is afterwards neutralized with chalk, or into maltose by mixing it with an infusion of malt. The glucose or maltose is then fermented with yeast, the product being distilled and the resulting alcohol rectified. Woody fibre, paper, linen and other substances having the same empirical formula as starch, if acted on by sulphuric acid will yield glucose, from which alcohol may be prepared. Knowing this, Mr. Broeconnet in 1819 obtained glucose from cellulose, but found great difficulty in separating the sulphuric acid; at least

he found the process of separation too costly to render the manufacture commercially profitable.

Professor Alexander Classen, of Aix-la-Chapelle, has succeeded in utilizing the cellulose in sawdust by using gaseous sulphurous acid which can be easily driven off at a moderate heat. The process is briefly as follows: The sawdust is packed in a revolving iron cylinder lined with lead, and to the sawdust is added one-third of its weight of sulphurous acid dissolved in water, the temperature of the cylinder being thereupon raised to about 295 degrees F. The gas is driven out of the water into the wood, on which it acts, converting it into glucose or grape sugar in about three hours. The sulphurous acid and steam are then blown off, the converted sawdust passed into exhausting batteries, where the sugar is dissolved out, and the solution thus resulting is neutralized as far as necessary with carbonate of lime. Two kinds of sugar are present—pentose, which is non-fermentable, and from seventy to eighty per cent. of glucose, which is fermented and distilled in the accepted way. A large industrial plant for the manufacture of alcohol in this way has been erected. Experts think that all our alcohol will eventually be made by this process. The washed out residue from the exhausters can be used for fuel and even for manufacturing wood alcohol.

NOTES.

A New Anaesthetic.—From a French journal comes the announcement of a new and painless anæsthetic. It is a liquid, is obtained from a plant in Japan and is called "scopolamine." Administered by hypodermic injection, it will induce sleep for eight or nine hours, has no after effects and is said to be far superior to any other drug used for the same purpose.

Recent Explorations of the Atmosphere.—The problem of the circulation of the currents of the upper air is one difficult of solution. Some success has been attained in using kites for exploration; but a more promising method is the use of "ballons-sonders," which are small balloons inflated with about one hundred cubic feet of hydrogen, which expand as they rise and burst at a certain height. They carry up with them self-recording instruments which register the temperature, barometric pressure, etc. The fall is gradual, owing to a parachute attachment. Such balloons have been used in Europe during the last ten years. They were used for the first time in this country on the occasion of the "aeronautical concourse" at St. Louis, under the direction of Mr. A. Lawrence

Rotch, director of the Blue Hill Observatory, and Colonel J. A. Ockerson, chief of the Department of Liberal Arts. To each instrument is attached directions to the finder to send it either to St. Louis or Blue Hill, under promise of reward. Twice the height of nine or ten miles and a temperature of 68 degrees F. below zero was attained in September. In November temperatures of 72 and 76 degrees below zero were reached. Three balloons traveled more than two hundred miles and two attained a speed exceeding one hundred miles an hour, always towards the east. Experiments are to be continued.

The World's Coal Supply.—Not long since we began to grow alarmed over the prospect of a cessation of the world's supply of coal. Listen to these facts. In a recent report the Royal Commission states that there is underlying the United Kingdom 100,914,668,167 tons of coal, at a depth of less than 4,000 feet and in seams a foot and above in thickness, these being so-called "proved" coal fields. In unproved fields at less than 4,000 feet the estimate of the amount of coal is 40,000,000,000 tons. In proved coal fields below 4,000 feet the estimate gives 5,239,000,000 tons, and over one billion tons off the coast of Cumberland and South Wales below the sea bed. During the last thirty-four years Great Britain mined five and three-quarter million tons. If we take the 140,000,000,000 tons in the proved beds, we see we have about twenty-five times the amount mined still untouched. At the rate given for the last thirty-four years this ought to last 850 years, and although the rate of consumption will increase in the future, oil fuel and water-power are going to do a large share of the work. Now, the total square mileage of the coal areas of the world is 471,800. Of this Great Britain has 9,000 square miles. If we may take Great Britain as an index, it would seem that we need have no fear of a coal famine.

M. J. Ahern, S. J.

Boston, Mass.

Book Reviews

ESAME CRITICO DELLE XL. PROPOSIZIONE ROSMINIANE CONDANNATE DALLA S. R. M. INQUISIZIONE. Studi filosofico-teologico di un laico. *Giuseppe Morando.* Milano: L. F. Cogliati, Editore. 1905.

This volume, divided into two parts, the first cxxxvii. pages, the second 958 pages, is at once an apology for Rosmini and his adherents and an effort to prove that the condemnation of the XL. Propositions was due to a misunderstanding of them. The English-speaking reader of the first part of Mr. Morando's work will be reminded of another apology, because of the method employed by the present author to justify Rosmini.

It will be remembered that in his attack upon Newman Kingsley endeavored to throw such discredit upon the great convert to the Church that any answer from Newman would be taken to be unworthy of belief. Kingsley asserted that the Church, or at least certain Catholic moralists, authorized a person attacked to employ lying as a defense.

Mr. Morando's method of defense in the case of Rosmini consists in an effort to minimize the value of a condemnation by a Roman congregation, and this position he endeavors to establish by calling repeated attention to the case of Galilei. In addition, the author seeks to show that the Jesuits, who were the chief opponents of Rosmini, were unfair to him personally and perverted his doctrines in order to bring about their condemnation. He further dwells upon the friendship existing between Gregory XVI. and Rosmini and the mild judgment of the congregation upon the XL. Propositions in the time of Pius IX. Mr. Morando enlarges upon the opposition to Rosmini and points out that one of his principal antagonists was the Nuncio at Brussels, Gioacchino Pecci, later on Leo XIII.

Speaking of this last named personage the author permits himself to employ the following language, p. xxvi.: "I precedenti di Papa Pecci e le sue private opinioni erano talmente cosa notoria che un pubblicista fiorentino, David Norsa, alla notizia della sua elevazione fu udito in pubblico exclamare: 'Questo è il Papa che condannerà Rosmini!' " Mr. Morando has not a little to say about the reverence and the respect for the Church and her authorities entertained by not only Rosmini, but, too, by Rosmini's disciples. Possibly the epithet "Papa Pecci" is indicative.

Indeed, the entire first part of the volume is an exhibition of

intense feeling against all the opponents of Rosmini, and contains more than a suggestion that the opposition was insincere.

The Apology has all the marks of a brief drawn up by an advocate. The brief is in many respects very clever, but the bias is too visible to make it effective with a reader without any leaning one way or the other in the case under consideration. The second part of the work is exceedingly well done in form. Each Proposition is presented. Then follows an exposition of the sense in which it is understood by its opponents; and, finally, there is offered the meaning attached to the Proposition by the Rosminians.

To present the particulars of the examination of any of the condemned Propositions here would require too much space. It may be noted, however, that the obvious meaning of the several Propositions is that attached to them by the anti-Rosminians; and this appears to be almost, if not quite, admitted by Mr. Morando. The arguments in support of the Rosminian doctrines are all ingenious, and, in certain instances, go far to create the belief that Rosmini did not intend his teaching to depart in essence from that of the accepted Catholic philosophers and theologians. One thing is quite apparent, and it is that Mr. Morando was convinced that the Propositions are not self-evidently in accord with what is commonly regarded as Orthodox, either in philosophy or in theology.

As in the Apology, so in the Critique, the author's method is apt to disclose mistrust of the opponents of Rosmini the man, the philosopher and the theologian. As a specimen of book-making, *i. e.*, printing, etc., the volume is remarkably attractive.

W. R. C.

THE CRUX OF PASTORAL MEDICINE. The Perils of Embryonic Man: Abortion, Craniotomy and the Cesarean Section. By *Rev. Andrew Klarman.* 12mo., pp. 162. New York: Pustet & Co.

There is no more burning question at the present time than the one which has called forth this book. The future of society, the future of the nation depend on the right understanding and the faithful observance of God's holy fundamental laws on the relations of the sexes and the generation of the human race. No nation can prosper that violates these laws, and the individuals that compose it bring upon themselves misery here and hereafter. The warnings against race suicide are becoming louder every day, and laws that prevent it in its more flagrant forms are being more strictly enforced in all well regulated communities, but something more is needed to stay the blighting evil. The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, and the further we get away from that wholesome fear the nearer we draw to the precipice.

Our greatest hope for the correction of this evil lies with the doctors. We abstract of course from spiritual aid, and consider the physician not only as a healer of the body, but as a teacher of right ethics. If we can get our physicians to understand the enormous responsibility that rests on them in shaping the morals of their patients while treating their bodies we shall have made long strides forward in this battle with sin in its worst form.

The author of the "Crux of Pastoral Medicine" had this truth before him when he prepared his work. He outlined his purpose clearly as indicated by his sub-title, "The Perils of Embryonic Man," and he never departed from it, as is shown by the heads of his chapters, which are only ten in number.

The work is brief and to the point, and it deals with very important questions in a clear, straightforward manner. What is still better, it answers those questions. We have frequently heard conscientious physicians and medical students inquire for some brief work of this kind, and we hope that the present work will find its way into their hands.

CERTAINTY IN RELIGION. *Rev. Henry Wyman, Paulist.* 16mo., pp. 119. Paper, 10 cents; cloth, 50 cents. In paper, $5.00 a hundred. New York: The Columbian Press, 120 West Sixtieth street.

We look upon the multiplication of these manuals, explaining Catholic truth, as a sowing of the seed in ever broadening fields. We have Gospel warrant for scattering it abundantly, even though we foresee that much of it will fall by the roadside and be trampled down, or on rocky ground, where it will die for want of moisture, or among thorns, which will choke it. We have the consolation of knowing that some of it has already borne fruit a hundredfold, and looking out into the future, we can see the ripe harvests now awaiting the reaper.

Too much credit cannot be given the Paulists for their untiring labors in this field. They have been working from early in the morning, and their courageous untiring example has been a spur to those who have entered the vineyard, in obedience to the Master's call, later in the day. In the book before us Father Wyman states his purpose thus:

"In the following pages I have endeavored to give my strongest reasons for believing in the Catholic religion, and I hope that my non-Catholic readers will not be less inclined to weigh my arguments because I claim that certainty is attainable in religion."

The atuhor treats of "First Principles," "The Higher Knowledge," "The Primitive Revelation," "The Inspired Word," "Prophecies and

Their Fulfilment," "The Divinity of Christ" and then glances at the history of the Church from the beginning down to the present time.

The book has a tone of dignity about it not common to such unpretentious volumes, and it will appeal most strongly to persons of education.

SYNOPSIS THEOLOGIAE MORALIS ET PASTORALIS. Ad mentem S. Thomae et S. Alphonsi, Hodiernis Moribus accomadata. Tomus Secundus: Theologia Moralis Fundamentalis. *Auctore Ad. Tanquery.* 8vo., pp. 339. Tomaci (Belg.) Typis Societatis Sancti Joannis Evang.

Father Tanquery's work on Moral and Pastoral Theology is drawing to a close. The present volume, which we have received from Benziger Brothers, is the third to appear, and only one more volume is to come. The present book, which is the third in order of publication, but the second in order of matter, treats of the Fundamentals: "The End of Man," "The Foundation of Morality," "Human Acts," "Laws," "Conscience," "Sins and Vices" and "Virtues in General." The remaining volume will treat of virtues in particular and the precepts of God and the Church. It is now in press and will appear in the fall.

Without going into particulars, we repeat what we have said before on more than one occasion, that this manual is truly practical and exceptionally adapted to our conditions. It should enable the young priest to apply the principles of moral theology which he has learned in the seminary to the particular cases which he meets on the mission with conservatism, toleration and common sense. It should prevent him from making many blunders, painful to the penitent if not unjust, and humiliating to himself. It should teach him at once what many others with less practical books before them have learned only after years of experience.

MISSALE ROMANUM, ex Decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini Restitutum. S. Pii V. Pontificis Maximi iussu editum. Clementis VIII., Urbani VIII., et Leonis XIII. auctoritate recognitum. Editio Quinta post aeteram uti Typicam a S. R. C. Declaratam. Cum approbatione Sacr. Rituum Congregationis. 8vo. Neo Eboraci: Sumptibus et Typis Frederici Pustet. MDCCCCV.

This is a rare example of skillful book making. Most combination articles are failures, because whereas they are made to serve two purposes, they generally serve neither. We do not know if the publishers of this book intended it to be a hand missal and an altar missal, for we have not seen their advertisement, but it serves both purposes admirably.

It is compact, light in weight, convenient in form, and so well bound that it will lie flat open on the hand or on a missal stand, even at the First Sunday of Advent. The paper is tinted and thin without being transparent. The type is large and clear and the impressions are unusually even. The illustrations, head and tail pieces and ornamental initial letters are artistic in the best sense of the word. It is literally up to date, having the latest Masses in their proper places. It will be exceptionally useful to those who say Mass at stations and have to carry a missionary outfit with them. We very seldom receive a book which we can praise without reservation. This book is the exception.

THE TRAGEDY OF FOTHERINGAY. Founded on the journal of D. Bourgoing, physician to Mary Queen of Scots and on other unpublished documents. By the *Hon. Mrs. Maxwell Scott*, of Abbotsford. New edition. Edinburgh: Sands & Co. Received from Herder. Price, $1.10, net.

It would have been a barren triumph for the fiends who thirsted for the blood of Mary Stuart if they compassed her death without blackening her character. It was essential to their nefarious plan that she should go down in history as, from birth to death, a thoroughly disreputable woman, who had forfeited her throne through unbridled lust, which had prompted her to the murder of her husband, and who rewarded the generous hospitality granted her by her cousin, the Virgin Queen, by repeated attempts to assassinate her. With the exception of the stolid mob of British Protestants, it is to be doubted whether any one ever seriously believed these charges; but the process of historical vindication is proverbially a slow one. The pathetic narrative before us, compiled by Mrs. Scott from contemporary, and mostly unpublished, documents, of the last days and execution of Mary, brings out in relief what everybody felt in his heart to be true, that Mary died a martyr for her Catholic faith. Her blood was needed to seal and secure the ineffable blessings of the Protestant Reformation.

SCHOOL CIVICS. By *Frank David Boynton*, Superintendent of Schools, Ithaca, N. Y. 12mo., cloth, 368+xli. pages. List price, $1.00; mailing price, $1.10.

This book has been written in response to the widely voiced demand of civics teachers throughout the country for a text-book that is something more than a mere catalogue of existing political facts. While maintaining the strictest historical accuracy and the most painstaking exactness in the description of existing institu-

tions, it has been the primary aim of the author to bring this body of fact into vital relation with the experience of those for whom it was written.

The book is a simple, straightforward story of the origin and development of government in general and of our own government in particular, told in language easily comprehensible to pupils of grammar school and high school age. But it is much more than an historical account of the mere form of our government. It sees always the vital principle animating the form, and presents not only the theory of our political institutions, but also their actual working; not merely our written Constitution, but those great and vital unwritten principles as well. In this respect the book is unique among secondary school texts.

A Short History of Ancient Egypt. By *Percy E. Newberry* and *John Garstang*. One volume, cloth, 12mo. Net, $1.20, postage extra.

This is a brief history of ancient Egypt from the founding of the monarchy until the disintegration of the empire three thousand years afterward. The progress made by modern research furnishes, in the opinion of the authors, sufficient authority for setting aside the traditions of later historians, and for accepting instead, as the ground for the opinions they have expressed, the evidence of the monuments. It has been their aim to make no statement which does not rest upon the substantial basis of fact. The work is both scholarly and popular, and is written in a style as noteworthy for charm as for dignity and exactness. The joint authors are experienced students of Egyptian archæology, and the book is the ripest fruit of their extensive explorations. This brief handbook offers the general reader an unusual opportunity of obtaining the results of the very latest scholarship in attractive form.

From Ginn & Co., of Boston and New York, we have received the following publications, gotten up in the best form as to type, illustration, paper and binding:

Cyr's Graded Art Readers. Book II. By *Ellen M. Cyr*, author of the Cyr Readers. 12mo., cloth, 136 pages. Illustrated. List price, 35 cents.

To write a simple story based on the masterpiece of some famous painter, that will ring true to the young reader, and at the same time avoid belittling the painting and the artist, is obviously a delicate and difficult task. Miss Cyr is probably one of the very few children's authors capable of accomplishing this work with unques-

tioned skill and good taste. At any rate, Book One of her "Graded Art Readers" (known as Cyr's "Advanced First Reader") is the only noteworthy and successful attempt at this kind of composition.

In text, in illustrations and in its aim to help children appreciate what is beautiful in famous paintings, this second book of the series is a continuation of the work begun in the first volume. As in the earlier book, reproductions of masterpieces form the basis of the text, which consists of simple stories closely allied to the pictures.

LITTLE FOLKS OF MANY LANDS. By *Lulu Maude Chance*, Teacher in the First Grade, Public School, Riverside, Cal. 12mo., cloth, 112 pages. Illustrated. List price, 45 cents.

Chance's "Little Folks of Many Lands" is, within the limits of its subject, the highest type of supplementary reader. It is probable, in fact, that no other geographical reader since the Jane Andrews books has made so favorable an impression upon teachers, critics and readers who have examined the book. In particular, the author has aimed through her book to make the child familiar with the customs, manners and surroundings of the children of several race types. In an imaginary journey around the world the pupil visits many foreign children—the Eskimos, the Indians, the Dutch, the Africans, the Arabians, the Filipinos and the Japanese. He sees the little strangers at their games and sports and learns of their hearthstone stories and folklore tales.

TRACTATUS DE DEO CREATORE ET DE ANGELIS. *Auctore Laurentio Janssens, S. T. D.* Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. Price, $4.25, net.

This forms the sixth volume of the learned Benedictine's "Summa Theologica," a free commentary on the masterpiece of the Angelic Doctor. Like the preceding tomes, it is distinguished for vastness of erudition, a complete mastery of the ancient and modern literature on the subjects treated of and a firm grasp of the import and bearings of the revealed truths exposed and elucidated. It is just such a work as we may fancy the great Aquinas would produce were he living in our day. This is eminently true of the present volume; for, notwithstanding all the vagaries of the human mind during the past few centuries on the subject of the created universe, there is scarcely any error which was not already amply confuted by the Angel of the Schools. We can heartily recommend this treatise of Janssens to all those who wish to have at hand a triumphant refutation of the innumerable isms of the age.

THE MEANING OF THE IDYLLS OF THE KING. An Essay in Interpretation. By *Conde Benoist Pallen, LL. D.* 16mo., pp. 115. New York: American Book Company.

No higher commendation of this book can be given than the letter which the author received from Tennyson on the publication of a brief magazine article on the subject in 1885:

Aldworth, Haslemere, Surry, April 4, 1885.

Sir: I thank you for your critique on the "Idylls of the King." You see further into their meaning than most of my commentators have done.

Yours faithfully,

TENNYSON.

Mr. Conde B. Pallen, New York city, U. S. A.

The present essay is a still further amplification of the original conception, to which is added an appendix of notes elucidating some points passed over in the text.

COMPENDIUM THEOLOGIAE MORALIS. Beatae Mariae Virgini Dicatum. *Auctore Fr. Josepho Colasanctio,* Card. Vives, O. M. Cap. Editio VIII. 12mo., pp. 670. Neo-Eboraci: Fredericus Pustet.

It seems superfluous to recommend so well-known a book as the one before us, or to do more than to say that the eighth edition has appeared and that it is a model of the bookmaker's art. The size of the volume, the paper, the type—all prepossess one in its favor before he considers the subject matter. But its excellencies do not stop there; it is a model compendium as well as a model book. It possesses the three qualities essential to a work of the kind and often found wanting in whole or in part—clearness, comprehensiveness and accuracy. It ought to fulfil the author's purpose, which was to make a compendium of all moral theology sufficiently brief to enable the priest to review the whole field at least once a year.

SEVEN LAMPS FOR THE TEACHER'S WAY. By *Frank A Hill, Litt. D.* 12mo., pp. 34.

For forty years Dr. Frank A. Hill gave himself to the cause of public education and by his lectures brought inspiration and encouragement to hundreds of teachers. Of all his addresses the one entitled "Seven Lamps" has met with the widest appreciation. For the benefit of those who wish to preserve it we have recently published it in book form.

THE JONES READERS BY GRADES. By *L. H. Jones, A. M.,* in Eight Books. 12mo. Illustrated.

This series is intended to cover the eight grades of the elementary schools. Each book of the series is adapted to its place and part

in such a plan. The subject matter has been carefully chosen from all fields of knowledge desirable for children of the age for which it is intended. Nature study in all its branches holds a prominent place. The elements of ethics as applied concretely to conduct are taught. The illustrations are apt and beautiful, especially the colored pictures, which are masterpieces of the printer's art.

EARTH AND SKY. Number 3. By *J. H. Stickney.* 12mo., pp. 160.

In the preparation of this third number of "Earth and Sky" the author has endeavored to preserve the unity of the series and also to keep pace with the growing intelligence of its readers. The object has been to call attention to the panorama of nature in such a way as to make natural occasion for oral teaching. In the present number the forces of the material universe are called to mind, beginning with the life forces in plants and animals.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

"LES SAINTS:" Saint Columban (vers. 540-615), par l'Abbe Eug. Martin, pp. vi., 198. Saint Francis de Borgia (1510-1572), par Pierre Suau, pp. v., 204. Lecoffre, 90 Rue Bonaparte, 1905.

SAINTS AND FESTIVALS OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. By *H. Pomeroy Brewster*, author of "The Cross in Iconography," etc. 8vo., pp. 558. Illustrated. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company.

THE STORY OF THE CONGO FREE STATE. Social, Political and Economic Aspects of the Belgian System of Government in Central Africa. By *Henry Wellington Wack, F. R. G. S.* (member of New York Bar). 8vo., pp. xv., 634. With 125 illustrations and maps. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

THE SANCTUARY OF THE FAITHFUL SOUL. By the *Ven. Ludovicus Blosius, O. S. B.* (Louis de Blois), Abbot of Liessies. Translated from the Latin by the late Father Bertrand A. Wilberforce, O. P. B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo. Price, 75 cents, net.

A SPIRITUAL CONSOLATION and Other Treatises. By the Blessed Martyr *John Fisher*, Bishop of Rochester. Edited by D. O'Connor. B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo. Price, 30 cents, net.

IN THE MORNING OF LIFE. Considerations and Meditations for Boys. By *Herbert Lucas, S. J.* B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo. Price, $1.00, net.

THE ANGEL OF SYON. The Life and Martyrdom of Blessed Richard Reynolds, Bridgettine Monk of Syon, Martyred at Tyburn, May, 1535. By *Dom Adam Hamilton, O. S. B.* To which is added a sketch of the history of the Bridgettines of Syon, written by Father Robert Parsons, S. J., about the year 1595. Edited from a manuscript copy at Syon Abbey, Chudleigh. Sands & Co., Edinburgh. Received from Herder. Price, $1.10, net.

DAS EVANGELIUM DES HEILIGEN JOHANNES uebersetzt und erklaert von *Dr. Johannes Evangelist Belser*, ord. Professor der Theologie an der Universitaet zu Tuebingen. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. Price, $2.85, net.